

CS, 0070/3/F - Town Council Representations

Statement by Chairman of Stow on the Wold Planning Committee

Stow Town Council has consistently argued that the McCarthy & Stone proposal does not meet the requirements for C2 Extra Care Housing for which Brackley was given Outline Planning Permission. It is not appropriate for it to be dealt with as remaining matters under that permission and you should not consider it further in that context. We have consistently asked that Cotswold District Council should take advice of its own Counsel before determining this application

Our view has the support of Counsel, of our new Ward Member, of Councillor Keeling who helped during the illness of the late Councillor Dare, Of our County Councillor and of our Member of Parliament.

In our letter of 8 September- ^{finally} now included in your ^{additional update} ~~extra~~ pages we set out the general characteristics of Extra Care Accommodation and expressed the view that one and a half hours of care a week and very limited sleepover facilities for staff meant that the requirement for twentyfour/seven care was not met. We asked for evidence of the case law or decisions on which your officials assertion that the McCarthy & Stone proposal fell within the definition of C2. We suggested that the applicant be asked to provide this evidence. We have received no response to that request.

We urge you to delay consideration of this application until you have taken the advice of Counsel.

In our view the Proposal is for C3 accommodation and a new application for approval should be required

CS.0070/3/F - Objector's Representation

Good Morning

This Council has included a comprehensive Design Code in the emerging Local Plan and there are Neighbourhood Plans being developed up and down the Council's area by many towns and villages. Stow on the Wold is one and our Design Code, closely modelled on the Cotswold District one, has been written.

This scheme does not meet any of the objectives of either of the Design Codes and nor can it because of the fundamental mismatch between the standard plans used by McCarthy and Stone and the design aspirations of the inhabitants of Stow on the Wold.

Exhaustive commentary has been sent to your Planning Officer on why this scheme is flawed in its design and no amount of tweaking will overcome the problem with the brief.

The designs do not reflect or extend the Cotswold tradition, rather they are a caricature. This building will squat like a malevolent, misshapen and misbegotten toad on the principle northern gateway to our Town. The scheme has got to be classified as Major Development so paragraph 116, item iii of the NPPF must apply; to quote "an assessment..... of any detrimental effect on the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities, and the extent to which that could be moderated" This design most definitely harms the environment of the AONB and is not capable of being moderated..

It is apparent in the emerging Local Plan that this is one of the very few substantial sites in Stow remaining to be developed up until 2031. Are we to sacrifice this precious resource for a truly repulsive scheme which is rejected by the Town Council, the Town inhabitants, our new District Councillor and our County Councillor? I urge the Committee not to give the Officers' Delegated Powers to approve, at the least, and preferably to refuse this

scheme outright and instruct that it be re-designed to meet the original promises given by Brackley Investments.

~~My colleagues will elaborate on why McCarthy & Stone's Extra Care business model does not satisfy the requirements of the C2 Use Class.~~

Thank you

Three minute presentation against elements of the proposal on behalf of Mickleton Parish Council - 16/02049/REM | Reserved Matters application in pursuance of Condition 1 of planning permission ref. no. 14/02365/OUT (APP/F1610/A/14/2228762) for the erection of 90 dwellings, and associated infrastructure and Public Open Space | Land Parcel Off Broad Marston Road Mickleton Gloucestershire -

I have four major issues which I would like the Planning Committee to consider.

The first relates to Child Protection. It is a legal requirement of planning legislation that it must be considered whether children's best interests are relevant, and under the Health and Safety at Work Act (1974), contractors are required to conduct their business, and that includes planning and site design, without putting members of the public at risk, which includes vulnerable groups such as children. Children's interests are most definitely relevant when the layout of a residential housing estate has properties built right up to the North West boundary of the school. The boundary houses are close enough to enable any resident to look into the windows of the school and, for example, watch the children changing for P.E. or just indulge in voyeurism. This risk could be eliminated now by adopting a different site design with the planned houses bounding the school site being relocated to other parts of the site. If the site layout as presented here today is approved, the school has asked me to ask you the CDC Planning Committee, to put in writing to Mickleton School that the Site Plan in your view, does not create potential child abuse opportunities which could be eliminated by a different site design around the land of the school.

The second issue relates to the potential to improve road safety in Back Lane. Mickleton Parish Council believes that if all the houses on the North West boundary of the school were relocated to other parts of the site then better occasional car parking for the housing development generally could be achieved, and also a safer parent child "drop off area" could be developed for use at the beginning and end of the school day. This would alleviate an already dangerous situation that occurs daily on Back Lane during school peak times. If this suggestion is not adopted and the current site plan agreed this reserved matters planning approval will add further harm and dangers to the residents of the village who use Back Lane and Sovereign Fields.

My third issue relates to the LEAP area of the proposed site layout. The Parish Council would very much welcome some dialogue with Miller Homes over the position of any play equipment in this area as the Parish Council is currently installing new play equipment on the Victory Memorial Junior Playing Field and would want the combined areas to as much as possible support all areas of the Children's National Play Strategy

Lastly we would ask the Planning Committee to look closely at the ratio of stone to brick houses being proposed as we believe as currently presented the development does not reflect the dominance of stone in the village and it would be a shame if that prevailing character were to be undermined on this large site.

Finally I would like to emphasise that at no time has Miller Homes undertaken any consultation with Mickleton Parish Council or representatives from the Governing Body of Mickleton School, even though they have raised very legitimate concerns which have failed to be addressed properly. Paragraph 64 of The National Planning Policy Framework states that "permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions." The above points demonstrate that this applies here. At the very least, please defer a decision to enable improvement by negotiation.

Chris Morecroft OBE
Chairman - Mickleton Parish Council

CT, 8919/A - Applicant's Representations

Comments for Planning Application 16/02516/FUL

Summary of comments made on behalf of Coates Parish Council by Councillor Harrison on 12/10/2016 to the CDC Planning Committee

It is the understanding of Coates Parish Council that we are not a village that can provide for Sustainable Development due to our limited local services. Services which would be required to enhance the sustainability of our community.

This is an application to build a 4 bed detached property in the private residential garden of a semi-detached property. Removing garden space (in a village where there is already limited formal recreational space) to build a second detached property does not therefore appear to "enhance and improve the places in which we live our lives" as stated in the National Planning Policy Framework.

This development is not going to improve the conditions in which the people of Coates live, work, travel and take leisure. We do not have sustainable transport modes that would allow residents to utilise the local services of other communities.

In addition Article 53 of the policy framework states that: Local planning authorities should consider the case for setting out policies to resist inappropriate development of residential gardens – Coates is not a sustainable development.