

PL.7 SUBSTITUTION ARRANGEMENTS

Councillor Julian Beale substituted for Councillor RL Hughes.

Councillor RG Keeling substituted for Councillor AW Berry.

PL.8 MINUTES

RESOLVED that:

(a) the Minutes of the Meeting of the Committee held on 11th May 2016 be approved as a correct record;

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

(b) the Minutes of the Meeting of the Committee held on 17th May 2016 be approved as a correct record.

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

PL.9 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were no announcements from the Chairman.

PL.10 PUBLIC QUESTIONS

No public questions had been submitted.

PL.11 MEMBER QUESTIONS

No questions had been submitted by Members.

PL.12 PETITIONS

No petitions had been received.

PL.13 PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO HACKNEY CARRIAGE AND PRIVATE HIRE VEHICLES AND DRIVERS' LICENSING ADMINISTRATION AND CONSULTATION WITH THE LICENSED TRADE ON CHILD SEXUAL EXPLOITATION TRAINING

The Committee was requested to consider amendments to the administration of hackney carriage/private hire licensing and consultation with the licensed trade over child sexual exploitation training.

It was reported that the amendments had been proposed to ensure that the Council's procedures accorded with changes in policy and for reasons relating to 'good housekeeping'. Officers amplified aspects of the circulated report and Appendix in relation to the proposed process; DVLA checks; driver/vehicle inspections; and 'measured miles'. In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that the Council's disclosure process with the Police also identified any cases pending against Applicants seeking hackney carriage/private hire licences; and Officers investigated complaints relating to the cleanliness of licensed hackney carriage/private hire vehicles.

It was suggested that, if the Committee was minded to approve the revised arrangements, the first line of the sixth paragraph on page 35 of the Appendix should be amended to refer to 'the Head of Public Protection'. It was further suggested that, if the Committee was minded to approve the revised arrangements, the Officer recommendation should be amended to include reference to consultation with the licensed trade over child sexual exploitation training, with a further report thereon being submitted to a future Meeting of the Committee.

A Member contended that obstruction of an authorised Officer could be a serious offence and expressed the view that the penalty for such obstruction should be increased from the suggested 3 points to 6 points. However, this suggestion was not supported.

It was considered that the revisions would improve the licensing process and should therefore encourage more hackney carriage/private hire operators to offer the correct service to their customers.

RESOLVED that:

- (a) the revised arrangements for hackney carriage and private hire vehicle licensing administration be approved, as amended;**
- (b) a consultation exercise takes place with the licensed trade regarding the introduction of child sexual exploitation training, and a report thereon be submitted to a future Meeting of this Committee.**

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

PL.14 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.7315/B**

Outline Application for the erection of 40 dwellings and associated works at land parcel north of Chipping Campden School, Aston Road, Chipping Campden -

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 referred to the Sites Inspection Briefing which had been carried out at this site in June 2015, and reminded the Committee of the location of the site, drawing attention to the proposed layouts for the previously-refused application and the current application; landscaping; and the relationship between the proposed development and existing houses and allotments. The Case Officer displayed an aerial photograph of the site, together with photographs illustrating views of the site and access from various vantage points, and views from within the site.

A Member of the Town Council, two Objectors and the Agent were invited to address the Committee.

Both Ward Members, neither of whom served on the Committee, were invited to address the Committee. The first Ward Member contended that this application should be refused for reasons relating to impact on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and prematurity. The Ward Member quoted from Paragraph 116 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and expressed the view that the Committee's decision in July 2015 to refuse the previous application for 90 units had been correct. The Ward Member reminded the Committee that the Council was currently able to demonstrate a supply of housing land in excess of seven years, and he stated that a Planning Inspector had agreed with the Council's methodology in that respect. The Ward Member disagreed with the Officer view that this application did not constitute a 'major' development. He reminded the Committee that application was for forty dwellings on a site comprising 2.49 hectares and referred to an appeal decision on a site in Looe, Cornwall where it had been agreed as 'common ground' and by the Planning Inspector that a site comprising 1.45 hectares was a 'major' development. The Ward Member commented that the Council there had not been able to demonstrate a five-year supply of housing land and he contended that the population of Looe was approximately 5,300, while the population of Chipping Campden was approximately 2,300 and that, therefore, the Chipping Campden application should also be considered to be a 'major' development, and that it should be refused for the same reasons as the 2015 application. The Ward Member stated that, if this was considered to be a 'major' development, the Applicant would need to demonstrate 'exceptional' circumstances. The Ward Member considered that an over-provision of housing had been proposed for the 'cluster group' of villages around Chipping Campden in the emerging Local Plan, resulting in a 'front-loading' of delivery, and he expressed the view that it would prove difficult to find 'local' occupants for the affordable housing elements of such developments. The Ward Member reiterated the view that, as the Council was currently able to demonstrate a supply of housing land in excess of five years, the Committee would be able to refuse this application; commented that the Planning

Inspector might decide to uphold a refusal at appeal in order to protect an AONB site; and concluded by stating that the Committee should agree with the views expressed by the local community and refuse this application.

The second Ward Member stated that he supported the views expressed by his fellow Ward Member that this application constituted a 'major' development for Chipping Campden, which did not accord with the provisions of the NPPF and should therefore be refused. The Ward Member expressed the view that the application was premature and suggested that approval of this application at this stage in the Local Plan process could result in a requirement for over 12,000 new dwellings during the period of the Local Plan. The Ward Member considered there to be too much front-loading of development in the emerging Local Plan and contended that the supply of housing land would run out within eight years, resulting in the other market towns and larger settlements being required to accommodate an additional 8,000 new dwellings. The Ward Member concluded by stating that it was vital that this application be refused and that no further applications should be considered in respect of this site before 2026.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that a development comprising ten or more dwellings was considered to be a 'major' development in the context of fees; Members had to have regard to local character and distinctiveness when considering whether a scheme constituted major development; Officers had considered the characteristics and circumstances of this site in their assessment of the application and had concluded that it did not constitute a 'major' development; the Committee could to reach a different conclusion in that respect; the site had been identified in the emerging Local Plan as being suitable for housing development; each application was considered on its merits; consideration could be given to the cumulative impact in the future if the Committee was minded to approve this application as recommended; the development had been constructed and another application was submitted for development on the adjacent land; the Applicant and the Town Council had commissioned independent land surveys, which had concluded that the land was grade 3B and grade 2 agricultural land respectively; in the opinion of Officers there was no justification on this occasion to accept an affordable housing contribution of less than 50%; as this application was not considered by Officers to constitute a 'major' development, the Applicant had not been required to demonstrate 'exceptional' circumstances in relation to the provision of affordable housing; in the opinion of Officers, this application was acceptable in the context of Chipping Campden; it would be difficult to justify refusal for reasons relating to an adverse strategic impact on the town in light of recent decisions in Mickleton and Willersey; a total of ninety dwellings had been suggested for this site in the emerging Local Plan; a potential development site at Spring Hill, Chipping Campden had been identified but had been ruled out of the Local Plan process; in the opinion of Officers, there was no requirement to seek an independent traffic assessment; and, in the event that the Committee was minded to approve this application as recommended, measures had been suggested to mitigate the impact of the development on breeding skylarks.

Some Members considered that this application should be refused. Those Members referred to the comments of the Ward Members and the objections to the application submitted by the local community, and they considered that this application constituted a 'major' development in the context of Chipping Campden.

Other Members contended that this application did not constitute a 'major' development. Those Members commented that other settlements in the emerging Local Plan 'cluster' group had had significantly larger developments through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) process, at which stage the Town Council had supported development on this site against development proposed on the Badgers Field site. The Members considered there to be an identified need for affordable housing in the area, and that Chipping Campden was a sustainable town.

It was reported that the Cotswolds Conservation Board had not submitted a formal objection to this application and that, currently, no suitable alternative sites had been identified for inclusion in the emerging Local Plan.

The Ward Members were invited to address the Committee again. The first Ward Member contended that the circumstances of the appeal in Looe were remarkably similar to the circumstance of this application, whilst the second Ward Member reiterated his view that a development comprising forty units would be a 'major' development in the context of the town. The Ward Member commented that the Town Council was progressing development of a Neighbourhood Plan; that this application constituted the first phase of development across a larger site in this location; and that the supply of affordable housing was currently outstripping demand.

A Proposition that this application be refused for reasons relating to impact on the AONB and Conservation Area, and policy reasons, was duly Seconded. On being put to the vote, that Proposition was LOST. The Record of Voting in respect of that Proposition was - for 6, against 8, abstentions 1, absent 0.

Note:

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 16.6 a request was made for a Recorded Vote to be taken in respect of this Proposition and that was supported by the requisite number of Members. The Record of Voting was as follows:-

For: - Councillors Julian Beale, Alison Coggins, David Fowles, Mrs. SL Jepson, RG Keeling and MGE MacKenzie-Charrington - Total: 6;

Against: - Councillors AR Brassington, Sue Coakley, PCB Coleman, RW Dutton, M Harris, SG Hirst, Juliet Layton and Tina Stevenson - Total: 8;

Abstentions: - Councillor Miss AML Beccle - Total: 1;

Absent: - Total: 0.

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

The Head of Planning and Sustainable Communities was authorised to approve as recommended, subject to the prior completion of Section 106 Agreements relating to the provision of affordable housing and financial contributions in respect of education and libraries.

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

CD.4450/A**Erection of 5 dwellings and upgrading of existing allotments at Camp Gardens, Stow-on-the-Wold -**

The Case Officer reminded the Committee that this application had been approved by the Committee at its Meeting held on 9th March 2016, subject to the prior completion of a Section 106 Agreement relating to the provision of affordable housing at the site. As the Section 106 Agreement had not yet been completed, a Decision Notice had not been issued, so the Committee was invited to re-consider the provision of affordable housing at this development in light of the subsequent issue of new guidance on the provision of affordable housing, which constituted a material change in circumstances.

In response to questions from Members, it was reported that the Council could not insist on a financial contribution in respect of other improvements in the town, in lieu of a contribution in respect of affordable housing; and, as the original application had accorded with planning criteria and the provision of affordable housing on the site had not been an overriding requirement, the Committee was unable to now refuse the application for reasons relating to the provision of affordable housing.

It was considered that the proposed development would result in a small increase in the volume of traffic using the access lane, which would be improved as a result of the proposed development, and that this application had constituted a 'good' scheme. A Proposition, that this application be approved as recommended, was duly Seconded.

In response to a comment from a Member, it was reported that the Council had already taken a decision to amend the relevant policy in the emerging Local Plan, and that such amendment would be tested at the forthcoming public examination stage.

Approved, as recommended.

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

CD.0780/G**Erection of a Doctor's Surgery with associated parking (Reserved Matters details relating to the appearance of the building pursuant to outline planning permission reference 15/01718/OUT) at Tall Trees, Oddington Road, Stow-on-the-Wold -**

The Team Leader drew attention to the extra representations received since the publication of the Schedule of Planning Applications. The Team Leader reminded the Committee of the location of this site and displayed an aerial photograph of the site, together with photographs illustrating views of the existing buildings on the site, across the site and from within the site, from various locations.

An Objector was invited to address the Committee.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that the additional parking spaces referred to were for use in association with the proposed surgery; the original doctors'/staff parking area had been relocated elsewhere within the site; a separate application would be needed if it was proposed to sub-divide any part of the site into a separate planning unit; no further information had been received in respect of the pedestrian access proposed to the east of the site, which did not form part of this application; the proposed development was supported by the clinicians and the NHS; the purpose of this application was to address issues relating to the appearance of the building; the previously-proposed solar panels had been omitted in response to concerns raised over their potential adverse impact on a traditional building in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty; the proposed buttresses constituted a small projection in a traditional form; the proposal was to use natural Cotswold stone for the stone walling; landscaping details were to be submitted in accordance with the Condition attached to the outline planning permission; and rainwater harvesting was an issue that should have been addressed at the outline application stage, but the Committee's concerns could be expressed to the developer, together with concerns over the omission of the solar panels.

It was considered to be vital for Stow-on-the-Wold and the surrounding settlements to have a replacement surgery. One Member contended that, as this site was restricted, there could be a problem finding space for the future expansion of the surgery.

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

Approved, as recommended.

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

CD.6682/J

Erection of a primary health care centre and associated infrastructure, parking and landscaping at land parcel Stow Fair site between Maugersbury Road and A436, Maugersbury Road, Stow-on-the-Wold -

The Team Leader 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 Team Leader reminded the Committee of the location of this site and outlined the proposals, drawing attention to the proposed access and existing redundant buildings on the site. The Team Leader reported that the County Highways Officer had not raised any objections to this application, subject to a number of Conditions being attached to any Decision Notice, if the Committee was minded to approve the application. The Team Leader displayed an aerial photograph of the site, together with photographs illustrating views along the highway and through the site from various vantage points.

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

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that, at the time of the previous application, outline approval had not been granted in relation to the alternative site; there was considered to be an exceptional need for a new surgery in Stow-on-the-Wold; both applications had been recommended for approval, with the Tall Trees application being granted outline permission and the application on this current site being refused; the issue of a 'back-up' plan, as referred to by the Supporter, was not a material consideration for the Committee; the development on the Tall Trees site was at a more advanced stage and had received support from the NHS; in the opinion of Officers, the development proposed for that site would be more acceptable as there were landscape objections to the development proposed for the current site; access to this site would be easier for some patients of the surgery, but not all, and safe access could be achieved to both sites; approval of this application, without exceptional justification, could set a precedent for further development pressure on the site as there was permission for an acceptable, deliverable alternative site; if the Committee was minded to approve this application, a reserved matters application would have to be submitted to the Council at some time in the future; and the land levels dropped away from the site.

A number of Members considered that this proposal would have an adverse impact on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), and that the significance of such adverse impact outweighed any benefits that might accrue from there being a second option for the delivery of a new surgery for the town and surrounding area. Those Members also considered that the location of a new surgery would not have any impact on health issues. They noted that the alternative proposal was progressing and they expressed support for the Officer Recommendation.

Some other Members considered this current site to be the correct site for the new surgery, commenting that it had been the site originally preferred by the Doctors. Those Members contended that this application should be approved.

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

Refused, as recommended.

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

CD.6972/C

Erection of a new detached dwelling and double garage with accommodation over at land parcel north of Field Cottage, Fyfield -

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 outlined the proposals, drawing attention to its proximity to a number of Listed Buildings and a public right of way; the relationship between the site and Southrop; the proposed site plan; and the elevations and footprint of the proposed building. The Case Officer displayed an aerial photograph of the site and photographs illustrating views of the access and previous buildings on the site, and views from various locations along the lane, towards the site and from within the site. The Case Officer also displayed some photographs submitted by an Objector.

The Chairman referred to the Sites Inspection Briefing undertaken in relation to this application and invited those Members who had attended that Briefing to express their views thereon. Some Members expressed concerns over access, and space for turning vehicles in the lane. Other Members, in noting that there was existing pedestrian access to Southrop, considered that one well-designed dwelling would not have an adverse impact in this location.

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

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that little weight should be afforded to the reference to Local Plan Policy 19 in a previous decision letter from 2009, as it was time-expired having been superseded by more recent decisions and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF); as there was no specific guidance in the NPPF in relation to sustainability issues, Officers had relied on two appeal decisions in their re-assessment of the application and had reviewed their recommendation accordingly; and, in the determination of this application, no weight should be attached to the emerging Local Plan in relation to development in unsustainable locations as it had not yet been submitted for examination.

Some Members expressed support for this application because, they contended, it would encourage people to walk and would not lead to an increase in car-borne journeys. They referred to the evidence of previous buildings on the site and suggested that the occupiers of the proposed property could work from home, thereby reducing the potential number of vehicle movements.

Other Members expressed concern over issues of sustainability, pedestrian access along the public right of way which also passed through a flood plain, and the use of the access lane by service and delivery vehicles. Those Members considered there to be no precedent for building on this site, due to the length of time the previous buildings on it had been abandoned. They also referred to the lack of 'local' support for the application, and contended that development along the access lane was at capacity. There was an acceptance that small communities must be allowed to develop but, it was suggested, that was not the correct site for such development.

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.5679/C

Demolition of existing outbuildings and erection of 1 No. dwelling, detached garage building, vehicular access, landscaping, parking and associated works at Old Barn, 33 Gloucester Road, Stratton -

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 access; the proximity of the proposed building to existing, adjacent properties; layout; elevations; and the floor plan. The Case Officer displayed an aerial photograph of the site and photographs illustrating views along the public highway, the proposed access, across and from within the site, of the buildings proposed for demolition and into the garden of an adjacent residential property.

An Objector and the Agent were invited to address the Committee.

The Ward Member, who served on the Committee, was invited to address the Committee. The Ward Member explained that, although this site was in a built-up area of the village, it was in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, and he expressed his view that this application should be refused. The Ward Member contended that the proposed development would have a significant impact on views from a footpath to the south-west of the site. The Ward Member referred to a previous appeal decision relating to this site when the Inspector had considered the proposed development to be 'totally unacceptable' because of its impact on Old Barn, which the Ward Member considered to be an undesignated heritage landmark building. The Ward Member explained that the proposed access would be close to the door and windows of Old Barn and stated that a development comprising a single-storey building in the correct location might be acceptable on this site. The Ward Member considered that the proposed building would have an adverse impact on Old Barn, and he concluded by expressing his view that this application should be refused.

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

(a) Deferred for a Sites Inspection Briefing to assess the impact of the proposed development on the adjacent Listed Building;

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

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

Note:

It was considered appropriate for all Members of the Committee to attend this Sites Inspection Briefing because it was considered to be important to assess the impact of the proposed development on the Listed Building 'on the ground'.

CD.9536

Alterations and extension to create a new dwelling at Bier House, Lower Street, Blockley -

It was reported that the Applicant had requested that consideration of this application be deferred in order to allow time for a response to the Conservation Officers' comments to be formulated and submitted to the Council, and for minor amendments to the scheme to be considered.

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 outlined the proposals, drawing attention to the existing and proposed elevations and floor plan. The Case Officer displayed photographs illustrating views of the building and rear garden area from various vantage points, and views from within the site. It was confirmed that the proposal did not include any off-street parking, and that no heads of terms for a legal agreement to secure the profits of the scheme towards the Church had been received.

A representative of the Applicant was invited to address the Committee.

The Ward Member, who served on the Committee, was invited to address the Committee and explained that the proposal was to bring a redundant building back into use for the benefit of the local community. The Ward Member referred to the previous use of the building for storage and stated that it had been redundant for some time. The Ward Member contended that this application would create a much-needed, one-bedroom cottage which could be suitable for people who were seeking to downsize without down-grading. The Ward Member further contended that there was a major gap in the provision of this housing and stated that this application would be an excellent way to make a difference. The Ward Member expressed the view that leaving this building to deteriorate further would cause more harm to the Conservation Area and Church than would be caused by the current proposal. The Ward Member considered the proposed design to be a good one, and pointed out that it would retain the façade of the building, which she considered to be very attractive. The Ward Member explained that the proposal would not have any adverse impact on the view of the Church spire and that, if approved, would help raise money which was vital for the protection of the Church in all its glory. The Ward Member reminded the Committee that the Parochial Church Council had commissioned an independent conservation report, which had confirmed that the proposed development would not have any adverse impact on the Conservation Area. The Ward Member stated that residents were well-aware of the historic nature of the village, and were mindful of its protection, without seeking to restrain growth. A majority of the local community had supported the proposal and the Ward Member urged the Committee to listen to the views of the local community and to realise that it was looking to the future of both the building and the Church, and seeking to protect a community asset. The Ward Member explained that the building's location in the centre of the village meant that it was within walking distance of the facilities, and commented that on-street parking in this vicinity was better than it was in many other villages. The Ward Member expressed the view that the advantages of the proposal outweighed any harm, and concluded by stating that the proposed design would protect the building, was not out of character, and would provide a small garden area.

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

Deferred for a Sites Inspection Briefing to assess the impact of the proposed development on neighbouring properties, an adjacent Listed Building, the Conservation Area and the highway.

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

PL.15 DURATION OF MEETING

Attention was drawn to Council Procedure Rule 9, and a vote was taken as to whether the Meeting should continue.

RESOLVED that the Meeting be continued.

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

PL.16 SCHEDULE OF APPLICATIONS (CONTINUED)

RESOLVED that the remaining applications be dealt with in accordance with Minute PL.14 above.

CD.6964/Z

The restoration, repair and reuse of existing buildings, including works the Granary, Ox Barn, Lambing Sheds and Pigsties, the conversion of the Hay Barn to form guest bedrooms, the rebuilding of former barns as guest bedrooms, the siting of treatment and wellbeing structures, the Change of Use of an equestrian riding arena and other land, part to include overflow car parking, the planting of an orchard, landscaping and all other associated works; including the Change of Use from part agricultural, equestrian, D1, D2 and B1 Use Classes to a composite use comprising A3, C1, D1 and D2 Use Classes at Manor Farm Barns, Southrop -

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 outlined the proposals, drawing attention to the site plan; car parking; landscaping; a section of new-build adjacent to the boundary wall; and proposed elevations. The Case Officer displayed an aerial photograph of the site and photographs illustrating views of the access, the site from within the Churchyard and from within the site. The Case Officer suggested that, if the Committee was minded to permit this, and the subsequent application, an extra Condition relating to external lighting be attached to any Decision Notices.

An Objector, two Supporters and the Applicant were invited to address the Committee.

In response to questions from a Member, it was reported that the Applicant would require consent to amend the route of the public right of way across this site, if this was required; and that, in the opinion of Officers, the proposed landscaping scheme would not cause any obstruction of the public right of way.

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

Approved, subject to additional Conditions to be specified by the Case Officer.

Record of Voting - for 11, against 0, abstentions 0, interest declared 2, absent 2.

CD.6964/Y

Change of Use of the Granary, Ox Barn, Lambing Sheds and Pigsties, Hay Barn and associated land from part agricultural, equestrian, D1, D2 and B1 Use Classes to a composite use comprising A3 (food and drink), C1 (hotel), D1 (treatment and wellbeing/lectures/courses) and D2 (social events) Use Classes; replacement of former barns to provide guest bedrooms; construction of treatment and wellbeing buildings and the Change of Use of equestrian riding arena and other land, part to include overflow car parking, associated landscaping and all other associated works at Manor Farm Barns, Southrop -

The Case Officer confirmed that there were no further updates in relation to this application.

An Objector, two Supporters and the Applicant were invited to address the Committee and they confirmed that they had made all of their representations in relation to the previous application (application CD.6964/Z above referred).

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that the County Highways Officer had not required provision of 'brown on white' tourist attraction signs in connection with this application; it would not be reasonable to require the Applicant to provide such signs as the land on which they would be sited was not in the control of the Applicant and third parties could refuse to allow such signs to be sited on that land; and the Applicant was investigating the potential to use the postcode to direct visitors to the southern access to the site.

It was considered that, if the Committee was minded to approve this application as recommended, such approval should be subject to (i) no adverse comments being received from the Rights of Way Officer; (ii) a condition that the Applicant's Website should make it clear that visitors should access the site through the southern entrance and should not proceed through the village; and (iii) a further condition requiring the submission of external lighting details.

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

Approved, subject to additional Conditions to be specified by the Case Officer and to no adverse comments being received from the Rights of Way Officer.

Record of Voting - for 11, against 0, abstentions 0, interest declared 2, absent 2.

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 application CD.6682/J.

(ii) Public Speaking

Public speaking took place as follows:-

<u>CD.7315/B</u>)	Councillor B King (Town Council)
)	Mr. Dearden and Mrs. C Nixon
)	(Objectors) *
)	Mr. R Kisby (Agent)
<u>CD.0780/G</u>)	Mr. J Nutbourne (Objector)
<u>CD.6682/J</u>)	Mr. T Sumner
)	(Parish Council Representative)
)	Mrs. J Smith (Supporter)
)	Mr. J Nutbourne (Applicant)
<u>CD.6972/C</u>)	Councillor P McHugh (Parish Council)
)	Mr. P Bailey (Objector)
<u>CT.5679/C</u>)	Mr. S Bawtree (Objector)
)	Mr. R Ellis (Agent)
<u>CD.9536</u>)	Rev. Canon D Delap
)	(Applicant's Representative)
<u>CD.6964/Z</u>)	Mrs. M Davey (Objector)
)	Messrs. M Bacon and H Lauder
)	(Supporters) *
)	Mr. J Hibberd (Applicant)
<u>CD.6964/Y</u>)	Mrs. M Davey (Objector)
)	Messrs. M Bacon and H Lauder
)	(Supporters) *
)	Mr. J Hibberd (Applicant)

* these speaking slots were shared.

Copies of the representations by the public speakers would be made available on the Council's Website in those instances where copies had been made available to the Council.

PL.17 SITES INSPECTION BRIEFINGS

1. Members for 6th July 2016

It was noted that Councillors AW Berry, Sue Coakley, Alison Coggins, SG Hirst and Mrs. SL Jepson would represent the Committee at the Sites Inspection Briefing on 6th July 2016.

2. Advance Sites Inspection Briefings

It was noted that advance Sites Inspection Briefings would take place on Wednesday 6th July 2016 in respect of the following applications:-

15.05039/FUL - land off Delfin Way, Upper Rissington - full planning application for the erection of 24 dwellings, car parking and associated landscaping - to assess the site in the context of the rest of the settlement *;

15/05165/OUT - land to the south of Love Lane, Cirencester - outline application for the erection of up to 88 dwellings and associated landscaping - to assess the impacts on the local pattern of development, landscape and heritage assets *;

16/01883/FUL - conversion of 1 flat and 8 bedsits to 7 self-contained apartments including alterations to rear elevation at 3-5 Queen Street, Cirencester - to assess if the scheme constitutes unacceptable overdevelopment and to consider the impact on the locality and the amenities of the adjoining residential properties.

* it was considered appropriate for all Members of the Committee to attend these advance Sites Inspection Briefings as an approved duty because (i) the application at Upper Rissington was, potentially, contrary to the policy in the emerging Local Plan relating to retention of employment sites and (ii) an appeal had been lodged against the non-determination of the site at Love Lane, Cirencester and the Committee needed to form a view on the proposal given its scale and proximity to the strategic development site in Cirencester.

PL.18 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 11.05 a.m., and again between 1.20 p.m. and 1.40 p.m., and closed at 2.45 p.m.

Chairman

(END)