

COTSWOLD DISTRICT COUNCIL

PLANNING AND LICENSING COMMITTEE

14TH SEPTEMBER 2016

Present:

Councillor SG Hirst - Chairman
Councillor Miss AML Beccle - Vice-Chairman

Councillors -

AW Berry	M Harris
Sue Coakley	RL Hughes (until 2.10 p.m.)
Alison Coggins	Mrs. SL Jepson
PCB Coleman	Juliet Layton
RW Dutton	MGE MacKenzie-Charrington
David Fowles	Tina Stevenson

Observers:

Councillor NJW Parsons
(until 10.55 a.m.)

Apologies:

AR Brassington

PL.41 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

(1) Member Declarations

Councillor David Fowles declared an interest in respect of application CT.0133/H, as he had professional dealings with the Royal Agricultural University, and had attended events at the Harnhill Centre of Christian Healing. Councillor Fowles was invited to address the Committee in his capacity as Ward Member, and he then left the Meeting while that item was being determined.

During the consideration of application CT.0133/H, Councillor Juliet Layton declared an interest in the item as she lived in the same street as the Agent.

Councillor David Fowles declared an interest in respect of application CT.4936/1/B, because he was acquainted with one of the Objectors.

Councillor David Fowles declared an interest in respect of application CT.7362/C, because he was acquainted with the Applicant and one of the Objectors, and he left the Meeting while that item was being determined.

Councillor Mark Harris declared an interest in respect of application CT.0133/H, as he was acquainted with one of the Objectors and, in his capacity as Mayor of Cirencester Town Council, had attended functions at the Royal Agricultural University.

(2) Officer Declarations

There were no declarations of interest from Officers.

PL.42 SUBSTITUTION ARRANGEMENTS

No substitution arrangements had been put in place for this Meeting.

PL.43 MINUTES

RESOLVED that, subject to the following amendments, the Minutes of the Meeting of the Committee held on 10th August 2016 be approved as a correct record:-

(i) by deletion of the word 'would' from the penultimate line of the final paragraph of the preamble relating to application CD.9547 and its substitution by the word 'could' (Minute PL.36, page 48 refers); by deletion of the date 'Wednesday 3rd August 2016' in the second line of the preamble to Minute PL.39(2), and its substitution by the date 'Wednesday 7th September 2016'.

(ii) by deletion of the date 'Wednesday 3rd August 2016' in the second line of the preamble to Minute PL.39(2), and its substitution by the date 'Wednesday 7th September 2016'.

Record of Voting - for 11, against 0, abstentions 3, absent 1.

PL.44 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

(i) The Chairman reported that agenda item (9), relating to The Mobile Homes Act 2013, had been withdrawn, but would be re-presented at a later date.

(ii) The Chairman advised that application CT.2609/1/A on the Schedule had been withdrawn from consideration at the Meeting, in order to give the applicant the opportunity to address the comments of the Environment Agency.

PL.45 PUBLIC QUESTIONS

No public questions had been submitted.

PL.46 MEMBER QUESTIONS

No questions had been received from Members.

PL.47 PETITIONS

No petitions had been received.

PL.48 THE MOBILE HOMES ACT 2013 - INTRODUCTION OF NEW LICENSING PROVISION

This item was withdrawn at the Meeting, but would be re-presented at a later date.

PL.49 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:-

CT.0133/H

Erection of office and workshop facility for the promotion of technology in agriculture and to support Agritech Start-up and developmental companies (mixed B1/D1 use) at Lower Farm, Harnhill, Driffield -

The Case Officer drew attention to the extra representations received since publication of the Schedule of Planning Applications. A copy of a brochure relating to the activities and facilities available at the nearby Harnhill Centre of Christian Healing was circulated at the Meeting at the request of the Chairman of the trustees of the Centre.

The Case Officer reminded the Committee of the location of this site and explained that an advance, full Committee, Sites Inspection Briefing had been held to assess highway safety and visual impact issues. The Case Officer then outlined the proposals, and displayed photographs illustrating the nearby conservation area and listed building, public right of way, land ownerships, building elevations, the position of the proposed building, the location of the proposed replacement trees, and visibility splay details.

An Objector and the Agent were invited to address the Committee. The Chairman read out letter received from the Parish Council, given that it had not been able to send a representative to address the Committee on the application.

The Ward Member, who served on the Committee, was invited to address the Committee. While acknowledging the importance of the Royal Agricultural University (RAU) and its need to develop, the Ward Member referred to the

significant number of objections received to the proposals, as part of which he considered the 37 individual objections from such a small community as unprecedented. He believed that local residents appeared to have lost faith in the planning process during the consultation period, and expressed the hope that there would be meaningful engagement between the RAU and residents to seek to allay and address concerns.

Note:

At this juncture, the Ward Member left the Meeting while this application was being determined.

In response to various questions from Members, it was confirmed that the use of the building would be restricted to development comprising education and research and development purposes in connection with agriculture/agricultural technology; opening hours were restricted, and the suggested condition should relate to all users; there was a requirement for a comprehensive landscaping scheme to have been approved before commencement of the development; the County Highways Officer was content with the proposals, subject to appropriate conditions; the proposed removal of one cedar tree was to enable the applicant to retain a 'one-way' traffic system through the site, and replacement planting was proposed; the Tree Officer did not consider that the trees merited preservation through a formal order; the Conservation Officer was satisfied that the proposals would give rise to less than substantial harm on the setting of nearby heritage assets; there were general restrictions outside of the planning process in relation to the flying/use of drones, which would protect other land interests; no residential accommodation was proposed as part of the development; it would be inappropriate to seek to secure an alternative access; and that it was not necessary, or appropriate, for the restrictions to be the subject of a legal agreement. In summary, Officers remained of the view that, on balance, the benefits of the development of the site in terms of supporting a local education establishment and employer would outweigh its unsustainable location; and that the proposal accorded with the economic considerations of the National Planning Policy Framework and Local Plan Policies. The Case Officer advised Members that the County Highways Officer had been made aware that the speed survey had been undertaken outside of term time.

The genuine concerns of the Parish Council and various local residents were acknowledged. However, the majority of Members were satisfied that the issues of concern would largely be addressed through the conditions proposed. It was also acknowledged that the professional advice received suggested that there were no material planning issues on which a refusal could be substantiated.

However, some Members remained concerned about the proposed removal of one of the cedar trees, and it was duly Proposed and Seconded that permission be granted subject to the retention of the cedar tree that was proposed to be removed (either by way of condition or formal Tree Preservation Order).

Other Members felt that such a proposal could not be justified, given the advice of Officers, the fact that the removal of the tree was to aid vehicular flow within the site, and the fact that three new trees had been offered as replacement planting for the one larger tree that would be removed. An Amendment was duly Proposed and Seconded, that permission be granted subject to the additional conditions requested by County Highways and the amendment of the condition relating to hours of use.

Approved as recommended, subject to additional conditions (i) relating to the visibility splays and (ii) requiring the vehicular access to be laid out and constructed before the building is occupied; and the amendment of the wording of the hours of use condition.

Record of Voting - for 7, against 6, abstentions 0, Ward Member unable to vote and interest declared 1, absent 1.

CD.2930/V

Erection of a dwelling on land to the rear of Hillcrest, Bourton-on-the-Hill -

The Case Officer drew attention to the extra representations received since publication of the Schedule of Planning Applications. The Case Officer explained that an advance, full Committee, Sites Inspection Briefing had been held to view the site in the context of the Conservation Area, Listed Buildings and Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

The Case Officer reminded the Committee of the location of this site, which was within the Conservation Area and the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), and then outlined the proposals. Attention was drawn to the available plans/drawings/details, illustrating the nearby public rights of way, floor and section plans, building elevations, materials, landscaping proposals, and comparisons between the extant permission and the new proposals. The position of the proposed building, the location of the proposed replacement trees, and visibility splay details. Reference was also made to various photographs of views in and out of the site, and from ten view-points in and around Bourton-on-the-Hill.

The Parish Council and a representative of two Objectors were invited to address the Committee.

The Ward Member, who served on the Committee, was invited to address the Committee. The Ward Member drew attention to the high number of objections received to the proposal, including from three local parish councils, and expressed concerns over the impact the building would have on the Conservation Area and AONB; the amount of glass to be used and, generally, the amount of non-vernacular materials proposed; the impact on nearby listed buildings, including the view of the Church; and the design and massing of the building, particularly given its prominent location.

In response to a specific question from a Member, it was confirmed that, notwithstanding views to the contrary, Officers had been consistent with advice that the 2007 planning permission had been lawfully implemented and was extant. As such, Officers were content that the principle of a dwelling at the application site had been established and, consequently, consideration had not been given to alternative uses for the site given the fall-back position. It was also confirmed that, as part of the appeal against the Council's refusal of a revised application in 2012, the Inspector had not formed a view as to whether the 2007 permission had been extant.

In response to other questions, Officers advised that the amount of glazing had been reduced and the impact had been reduced by the introduction of oak slatting and non-reflective glass within the balustrading; whilst the extant scheme had elements of the vernacular within its design, this did not apply to the proportions

or massing; previous attempts to design a vernacular building had not proven particularly successful, hence the contemporary approach which would also provide greater flexibility in terms of working within the topography of the site; while there would be distant views of the building, such views were not considered to be harmful as the proposed dwelling would be seen in context with the built form of the village; the revisions sought to minimise light pollution; Historic England had not objected to the application insofar as possible impact of views of the Grade I listed Church; the use of contemporary architectural styles was often tempered by the use of local materials, and there were such examples in the village and in nearby settlements; standing seam zinc as a roof material would weather and/or could be treated so as to be non-reflective and less prominent and a sample would be required by condition; Bourton-on-the-Hill was not considered to be a sustainable settlement; and it was not considered that the proposed development would result in harm to the identified heritage assets.

There was a difference of opinion amongst the Committee Members. A number of Members preferred the extant proposals, given that these respected the vernacular forms and the relative homogeneity of architectural forms in the settlement, and were therefore more fitting to what was considered to be a unique Cotswold village. These Members also referred to the significant weight of local opposition to the proposals. However, other Members believed that the proposals now before Members represented an exciting, innovative and contemporary approach, and one which would not be harmful to the setting or the historic assets.

A Proposition was duly made and Seconded, that the application be refused on the grounds that the larger development now proposed would, due to its location, scale and design, have a greater and unacceptable impact on the landscape and setting of nearby heritage assets; would not preserve or enhance the Conservation Area; and would be contrary to Policies 15 and 19 of the Local Plan. Upon being put to the vote, the Proposition was Lost.

A Further Proposition, that the application be approved as recommended, was then duly Seconded.

Approved as recommended.

Record of Voting - for 8, against 5, abstentions 0, Ward Member unable to vote 1, absent 1.

Note:

On being put to the vote, the first Proposition, that this application be refused, was LOST. The Record of Voting in respect of that Proposition was - for 5, against 8, abstentions 0, Ward Member unable to vote 1, absent 1.

CT.5795/W

Extension to dwelling at Elmleaze Farm, Westonbirt Road, Westonbirt -

The Team Leader reminded the Committee of the location of this site, and explained that a decision on the application had been deferred at the last Committee Meeting for a Sites Inspection Briefing to assess the impact of the proposal on the historic fabric of the listed building. The Team Leader displayed an aerial photograph of the site, and photographs illustrating existing and

proposed site plans and elevations. Attention was also drawn to the section of rear wall that was to be removed.

One of the Applicants was invited to address the Committee.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that Officers' principal concerns related to the proposed removal of a rear stone wall, the visual impact of the proposed link on the Listed barn, and the proposal to create a new doorway in that barn at first-floor level; pre-application discussions had taken place over the proposed scheme; the Applicants were seeking removal of the wall in order to enlarge the kitchen and to create a link between the barn and the existing house; the house, which dated back to 1882, had a long history of numerous extensions and additions; and there were numerous Grade II listed barns within the District.

It was noted that Officers did not consider that the proposal would have a significantly harmful impact on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty; and that while it would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of the listed building, there were no public benefits to outweigh the level of harm that would be caused.

Whilst acknowledging the views of Officers, Members felt that the proposal represented an imaginative, innovative and sensitive scheme which would secure the long-term future of the building while allowing the building to serve the needs of modern society, in line with National Planning Policy Guidance. As such, and on balance, they felt that the scheme should be approved.

A Proposition, that this application approved subject to appropriate conditions, was duly Seconded.

Approved, subject to conditions to be specified by the Case Officer, including relating to materials and internal/external detailing.

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

Note:

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

CT.5795/X

Alterations and extension to dwelling at Elmleaze Farm, Westonbirt Road, Westonbirt -

The Team Leader confirmed that this application was for the listed building consent associated with the previous planning application (approved by the Committee).

One of the Applicants was invited to address the Committee, but she explained that she had made all of her representations in respect of the previous application (application CT.5795/W above referred).

A Proposition, that this application approved subject to appropriate conditions, was duly Seconded.

Approved, subject to conditions to be specified by the Case Officer, including relating to materials and internal/external detailing.

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

Note:

This decision was contrary to the Officer Recommendation for the same reasons advanced in connection with the related planning application (application CT.5795/W above).

CT.4936/1/B

Demolition of existing conservatory and bay window, first floor extension and re-modelling and partial loft conversion at The Close, The Croft, Fairford -

The Case Officer drew attention to the extra representations received since publication of the Schedule of Planning Applications and explained that a decision on the application had been deferred at the last Committee Meeting for a Sites Inspection Briefing to assess the impact of the proposal on the setting of the adjacent Grade II listed building and the living conditions for its occupants, as well as the impact on the Conservation Area.

The Case Officer reminded the Committee of the location of this site, and outlined the proposals, drawing attention to access and the proximity of the site to a Listed Building. The Case Officer displayed an aerial photograph of the site and photographs illustrating views of the existing building and into the garden/patio area of the adjacent property, elevation details, and a 'mock-up' of the height of the proposed new build.

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

The Ward Member, who served on the Committee, was invited to address the Committee, and expressed the view that the proposals would have a negative impact on the Conservation Area and adjacent properties. She felt that, if additional accommodation was to be provided, then a more appropriate and sensitive scheme should be sought.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that Officers believed that the proposals represented an improvement on the currently poor form and detailing of the current building; the form of the raised section of the building would not be contrary to the character of the area; the proposed conditions would protect the amenity of nearby residents; the increased shadowing from the heightened building height was not considered to be significant; and precedent was not an issue. It was also confirmed that possible changes to the scheme suggested at the Sites Inspection Briefing had not been discussed with the applicant.

A number of Members supported the views expressed by Officers and concurred that any impact on neighbouring properties and the Conservation Area would be mitigated by the conditions proposed.

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

Other Members, however, remained concerned that the dwelling was in close proximity to a Grade II Listed Building, and was surrounded by a number of other Listed and important buildings. It was accepted that the proposals represented a significant improvement architecturally over what existed, it was felt that there was a huge amount of space around the property to allow it to be extended without it having to increase in height - and that this would be far preferable and more acceptable in planning terms.

Whilst accepting that refusal could not be sustained in terms of loss of light to adjoining properties, precedent, or the loss of a bungalow, these Members remained concerned about the impact and harm of the proposals on the setting of the adjacent Listed Building and the Conservation Area. A Further Proposition, that this application be refused on such grounds, was duly Seconded.

Refused on the grounds that the proposal, by virtue of its height, scale and location, is considered to be harmful to the setting of the listed building and to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Record of Voting - for 9, against 4, abstentions 0, Ward Member unable to vote 1, absent 1.

Notes:

(i) On being put to the vote, the first Proposition, that this application be approved as recommended, was LOST. The Record of Voting in respect of that Proposition was - for 4, against 9, abstentions 0, Ward Member unable to vote 1, absent 1.

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

CT.2609/1/A

Erection of single-storey extension to lobby at The Colt Car Company Ltd., Watermoor Road, Cirencester -

This item had been withdrawn from consideration at the Meeting, in order to give the applicant the opportunity to address the comments of the Environment Agency.

CT.7362/C

Two-storey extension at Rose Cottage, London Road, Poulton -

The Case Officer drew attention to the extra representations received since 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 access and the proximity of the site to a Listed Building. The Case Officer displayed photographs of the site, views towards and from the adjacent property, elevation details, the boundary wall, and one which demonstrated the different levels between Rose Cottage and The Old Forge.

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

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that the property was not curtilage listed, although it was attached to a listed building; the scale of the extension and its level of separation from the Old Forge would ensure that the setting of that heritage asset would be preserved; and that the design sought to minimise any impact on the neighbouring property.

Notwithstanding the views of Officers, a number of Members maintained some concerns as to the impact on the adjacent Listed Building and Conservation Area, and on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties. Accordingly, a Proposition, that this application be deferred for a Sites Inspection Briefing (conducted by the Panel), was duly Seconded. However, on being put to the vote, the Proposition was Lost.

A Further Proposition, that the application be approved as recommended, was then made and duly Seconded.

Approved as recommended.

Record of Voting - for 11, against 1, abstentions 1, Ward Member unable to vote and interest declared 1, absent 1.

Note:

The Record of Voting in respect of the first Proposition was - for 5, against 7, abstentions 1, Ward Member unable to vote and interest declared 1, absent 1.

CD.1566/D

Demolition of existing dwelling, erection of replacement dwelling, pool building and ancillary outbuilding and formation of alternative access at Severn House, Upper Oddington, Moreton-in-Marsh -

The Case Officer drew attention to the extra representations received since 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 fact that the site was just outside the Conservation Area, between Lower and Upper Oddington, was in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty; and that a public right of way ran to the south of the existing dwelling. The Case Officer displayed photographs of the existing house, views from the right of way, the elevated nature of the site, and the previously-permitted proposals (2015).

The Agent was invited to address the Committee.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that the proposals were considered to be an improvement upon a revised scheme that had been submitted in 2016 and subsequently withdrawn; the new dwelling occupied approximately the same footprint as the existing one; all protected trees would be preserved; the previous permission could still be implemented; the site could readily accommodate all proposed developments; and the site compound had been introduced to allay local concerns, and could in any event be implemented during construction without the need for permission.

Approved as recommended.

Record of Voting - for 14, against 0, abstentions 0, absent 1.
CT.3452/D

Erection of one detached dwelling (reserved matters application pursuant to the outline permission ref: 15/04480/OUT) on land at 7 Empire Villas, Ashton Road, Siddington -

The Team Leader drew attention to the extra representations received since publication of the Schedule of Planning Applications. The Team Leader reminded the Committee of the location of this site and the outline permission granted earlier in the year, and displayed an aerial photograph of the site in relation to adjacent dwellings.

In response to various questions from Members, the Team Leader clarified the scale and extent of development, its orientation compared to the adjacent dwellings, the proposed materials, that there were no issues regarding overlooking or loss of privacy, and the detail of the proposals was neither uncommon nor inappropriate in the locality.

Approved as recommended.

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

CT.6139/Y

Erection of garages and staff accommodation and boiler room and Change of Use of agricultural land to domestic curtilage at Manor Farm Barn, Lower End, Daglingworth -

The Team Leader reminded the Committee of the location of this site and briefly outlined the proposals. The Team Leader displayed an aerial photograph of the site and its surroundings, together with photographs illustrating views of the existing building and land from various locations, and the previously-permitted and withdrawn schemes.

One of the Applicants was invited to address the Committee.

The Ward Member, who did not serve on the Committee, had been present at the Meeting earlier in the day but had not been able to be present for the consideration of this application. Accordingly, the Ward Member had submitted a letter setting out his views (which was circulated at the Meeting). In the letter, the Ward Member had expressed his support for the views of the Parish Council, expressing concern at the impact that the proposals would have on the edge-of-village setting, and on the Conservation Area and Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The Ward Member felt that the proposals would significantly encroach upon the open nature of a semi-rural setting and could not support an intensification of the built environment in such a sensitive setting.

In response to various questions from Members, it was confirmed that Daglingworth was not defined as a sustainable community; each application had to be dealt with on its own merits and judged objectively; the design amendments made, and reduction in height and depth of the lower element meant that the proposals were more in keeping with the surroundings; the annexe accommodation was intended to be flexible in that it could be self-contained accommodation for guests and family or as home office space, albeit conditioned

so as to be used/occupied for purposes incidental to the use of the main dwelling; there was sufficient garden/amenity space; and, overall, Officers did not consider that the proposals would harm the historic or natural environment, or detract from the amenity enjoyed by neighbouring residents.

A Proposition, that consideration of this application be deferred for a Sites Inspection Briefing (conducted by the Panel) to assess the impact of the proposed development on the historic and natural environment, including Daglingworth Manor and the enclosing wall, was duly Seconded.

Some Members suggested that a Sites Inspection Briefing was unnecessary on this occasion, because they considered that the proposed extension was not a 'mirror image' of the extension on the adjoining dwelling and would therefore have a detrimental impact on the street scene.

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

During the debate, a third Proposition, that the application be refused due to its harm on the historic and natural environment, was not Seconded.

Approved, as recommended.

Record of Voting - for 10, against 1, abstentions 2, absent 2.

Note:

On being put to the vote, the first Proposition, that consideration of this application be deferred for a Sites Inspection Briefing, was LOST. The Record of Voting in respect of that Proposition was - for 5, against 6, abstentions 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.

(ii) Public Speaking

Public speaking took place as follows:-

<u>CT.0133/H</u>)	Mr. R Davies (Objector)
)	Mr. S King (Applicant)
<u>CD.2930/V</u>)	Councillor A Vigriff (Parish Council)
)	P Cairnes QC (Objectors' representative)
<u>CT.5795/W</u>)	Mrs. S Fitzpatrick (Applicant)
<u>CT.5795/X</u>)	Mrs. S Fitzpatrick (Applicant)
<u>CT.4936/1/B</u>)	Councillor R Harrison (Parish Council)

)	Mr. R Barry (Objector)
<u>CT.7362/C</u>)	Mr. D Drayton (Objector)
)	Ms A Mann (Applicant) *
)	Mr. D Sullivan (Agent) *
<u>CD.1566/D</u>)	Mr. S Taylor (Agent)
<u>CT.6139/Y</u>)	Mr. N Campbell (Applicant)

* this speaking slot was 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.50 SITES INSPECTION BRIEFINGS

1. Members for 5th October 2016

It was noted that AR Brassington, PCB Coleman, SG Hirst and RL Hughes would represent the Committee at the Sites Inspection Briefing on Wednesday 5th October 2016.

Councillor Miss AML Beccle would not be able to attend and would, therefore, arrange for a substitute representative.

2. Advance Sites Inspection Briefings

It was noted that advance Sites Inspection Briefings would take place on Wednesday 5th October 2016 in respect of the following applications:-

16/01657/FUL - installation of 2 x 18m wind turbines at Withington Estate, Withington - to assess the impact of the proposal on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and public right of way - Panel visit;

16/01818/OUT - Change of Use of land to leisure use following mineral extraction and erection of Country Park and Visitor Centre, 47 holiday homes, 30 hotel bedrooms and 30 apartments, including re-siting of previously approved hotel apartments, apartments and holiday homes associated with landscape/engineering work and infrastructure associated with the existing leisure development (all matters reserved) at Claydon Pike, London Road, Lechlade - to assess the landscape impact of the proposed development on the character and appearance of that part of the Cotswold Water Park - Visit by all Members of the Committee (approved duty) given the magnitude/scale of the proposals;

16/02598/OUT - outline application with all matters reserved except access for the construction of up to 98 dwellings (with up to 50% affordable housing) and associated works on land off Berkeley Close, South Cerney GL7 5UN - to assess the impact of a major residential development on the village - Visit by all Members of the Committee (approved duty) given the magnitude/scale of the proposals;

15/03597/FUL - conversion of former inn to 2 no. residential dwellings and erection of 2 no. residential dwellings within the former inn car park, with car parking and associated works at The Old White Horse Inn, Stroud Road,

Frampton Mansell - to assess the sustainability of the site and the impact on the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty - Panel visit;

16/03085/FUL - retrospective change of use of agricultural land to provide vehicular access, and reconfiguration of car parking at Jolly Nice, A419 Stroud Road, Frampton Mansell - to assess the impact on the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty - Panel visit.

PL.51 OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business that was urgent.

The Meeting commenced at 9.30 a.m., adjourned between 10.55 a.m. and 11.05 a.m. and again between 1.15 p.m. and 1.30 p.m., and closed at 3.08 p.m.

Chairman

(END)