

COTSWOLD DISTRICT COUNCIL

PLANNING AND LICENSING COMMITTEE

14<sup>TH</sup> DECEMBER 2016

Present:

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

Councillors -

AW Berry	David Fowles
Sue Coakley	Mrs. SL Jepson
Alison Coggins	Juliet Layton
PCB Coleman (until 5.10 p.m.)	MGE MacKenzie-Charrington (until 4.00 p.m.)
RW Dutton	Tina Stevenson
Jenny Forde (until 4.00 p.m.)	

Substitutes:

T Cheung (until 1.00 p.m., and then  
from 2.10 p.m.)      JA Harris (until 3.20 p.m.)

Observers:

Julian Beale (from 9.45 a.m. until 2.45 p.m.)	NJW Parsons (from 11.25 a.m. until 3.50 p.m.)
RL Hughes (from 11.00 a.m. until 1.50 p.m.)	SDE Parsons (until 12 noon) LR Wilkins (from 10.10 a.m. until 12.55 p.m.)

Apologies:

AR Brassington      M Harris

PL.79      DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

(1)      Member Declarations

Councillor T Cheung declared an interest in respect of application CT.9103, because he had previously operated a business in the village.

Councillor David Fowles declared an interest in respect of application CD.1236/1/F, because he was acquainted with the Agent, and he left the Meeting while that item was being discussed.

Councillor David Fowles declared an interest in respect of application CD.2288/W, because he was acquainted with the Applicant, and he left the Meeting while that item was being determined.

Councillor David Fowles declared an interest in respect of application CT.9171, because he was acquainted with the Applicant, and he left the Meeting while that item was being discussed.

Councillor SG Hirst declared an interest in respect of application CD.4049/1/M, because he was acquainted with the Objector.

Councillor Mrs. SL Jepson declared an interest in respect of application CD.2288/W, because she was acquainted with the Applicant.

Councillor MGE MacKenzie-Charrington declared an interest in respect of application CD.4049/1/M, because he was a customer of the newsagent and was acquainted with the Objector.

Councillor NJW Parsons declared an interest in respect of application CT.8879/B, because he was a neighbour of the Applicant, his Wife was acquainted with the Applicant, the Applicant had made some unsubstantiated allegations regarding his conduct as a Councillor and his Wife's conduct as a Parish Councillor, and his Wife had objected to this application at an Informal Meeting of Brimpsfield Parish Council. Councillor Parsons was invited to address the Committee in his capacity as Ward Member, after which point he left the Meeting while that item was being determined.

Councillor Lynden Stowe had previously declared a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in respect of application CD.4931/2/J, because he had commercial relationships with the Applicant and the Objector. Councillor Stowe was not present at the Meeting while that item was being determined.

Councillor Lynden Stowe had previously declared a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in respect of application CD.2288/W, because he was related to the Applicant. Councillor Stowe was not present at the Meeting while that item was being determined.

(2) Officer Declarations

There were no declarations of interest from Officers.

PL.80 SUBSTITUTION ARRANGEMENTS

Councillor T Cheung substituted for Councillor AR Brassington.

Councillor JA Harris substituted for Councillor M Harris.

PL.81 MINUTES

**RESOLVED that the Minutes of the Meeting of the Committee held on 9<sup>th</sup> November 2016 be approved as a correct record.**

**Record of Voting - for 12, against 0, abstentions 3, absent 0.**

Arising thereon:

Public Questions (PL.71)

It was reported that written responses had been sent to the relevant questioners in respect of the second, third and fourth public questions, and that copies of those responses would be forwarded to all Members.

PL.82 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman referred to the Codes of Conduct for Members and Officers, and the Planning Protocol, which were contained in the Council's Constitution, and he reminded Members and Officers that they must abide by those Codes of Conduct and the Protocol at all times.

PL.83 PUBLIC QUESTIONS

No public questions had been submitted.

PL.84 MEMBER QUESTIONS

No questions had been received from Members.

PL.85 PETITIONS

No petitions had been received.

PL.86 REVISED SCHEME OF DELEGATION - PLANNING AND LICENSING COMMITTEE

The Committee considered a report detailing a suggested amendment to its current Scheme of Delegation relating to applications submitted on behalf of Officers, their partners and/or close relatives of Officers and/or their partners, or by Officers, their partners and/or close relatives of Officers and/or their partners when acting as the Agent.

It was reported that there were significant issues in the practicalities of implementing the current scheme on those occasions when Officers etc. were acting as Agents, and that issues were likely to become more common through increased joint working between Councils. It was therefore suggested that the Scheme of Delegation be amended, as follows:-

*'(vi) In all cases when applications or similar consents are submitted by an Officer/consultant employed by the Council (or their partner or close relatives) when acting as or on behalf of the agent, then the Officer/consultant shall declare their interest and shall have no involvement in the processing of the application/consent.'*

**RESOLVED that the revised Scheme of Delegation relating to the Planning and Licensing Committee be approved and adopted.**

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

**PL.87      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.9103**

**Outline planning application for the erection of up to 9 dwellings and associated access (appearance, layout, landscape and scale reserved for future consideration) at land east of Bell Lane, Poulton -**

The Case Officer drew attention to the extra representations received since the publication of the Schedule of Planning Applications, and those representations received prior to the start of the Meeting. The Case Officer summarised such representations, drawing particular attention to the Section 106 contributions in respect of primary and secondary education; a request for an independent review of the drainage information submitted; the extent of the Applicants' land ownerships in the vicinity of Bell Lane; additional/amended plans; and additional Conditions in the event that the Committee was minded to approve this application as recommended.

The Case Officer reminded the Committee of the location of this site and outlined the proposals, drawing attention to its proximity to the Conservation Area, Listed Buildings, protected trees and a public right of way; and an illustrative layout. The Case Officer displayed some aerial photographs of the site, and photographs illustrating views along Bell Lane and Ashbrook Lane, and from within the site towards Poulton; various drainage ditches; the access; and existing residential properties in the vicinity of the site.

A Member of the Parish Council, 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 and he stated that he refuted the comments made by the Agent in respect of public consultation over this application. The Ward Member referred to the arguments for and against this application, and he urged the Committee to consider the impact it would have on the lives of the people who, he contended, had been blighted by it over the past two years. The Ward Member considered the objections to be reasoned and considered, and he stated that there was no objection to the principle of development in the village. He expressed the view that this proposal would not provide betterment in respect of the potential for flooding in the village and that, indeed, it could lead to further incidents of flooding. The Ward Member expressed the view that the existing sewage infrastructure in the village was not fit-for-purpose and he expressed concerns over the proposed design which, he contended, was of a suburban nature. The Ward Member stated that Poulton had experienced a 7% increase in its housing stock over the past two years and that, further, there was no need for a development comprising nine executive houses. The Ward Member expressed concern at the lack of garages associated with this proposal and at the potential for additional light pollution. The Ward Member reminded the Committee that the Council had a land supply in excess of seven years and he stated that, in the emerging Local Plan, Poulton was considered to be an unsustainable development. The Ward Member suggested that 185 objections equated to one for every household in the village, and that this development would have an adverse impact on the local community. The Ward Member considered that the Poulton Working Group had submitted reasoned and considered arguments, and he stated his view that local residents had been stressed by this application and that the circulated report (submitted by the applicant) was riddled with inconsistencies. In conclusion, the Ward Member suggested that consideration of this application be deferred for an independent report.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that the Committee could seek an independent hydrological report if it so wished; in the opinion of the drainage expert, a catchment area of 1.37 ha would be sufficient to cope with run-off; the proposal was for the development to include swales to capture and control the overland flow of water; the application at Kingham, which had been referred to by a number of third parties, was outside the Cotswold District; the Committee was required to consider each application on its merits; advice from Thames Water was that, while drainage was an issue to be resolved, there were no objections to this proposal and so a Grampian-style Condition would not be appropriate on this occasion; the impact on the foul system was considered by Thames Water to be negligible; if the Committee was minded to approve this application, as recommended, a Condition relating to the future maintenance of the drainage system would be attached to any Decision Notice; in the opinion of Officers, the use of soakaways was not appropriate in this location due to the permeability of the ground so the use of attenuation pipes to achieve a drainage solution, as suggested, was the next best option; the proposal included one point of access to the development; if the Committee was minded to approve this application, as recommended, a Condition requiring the installation of water butts would be attached to any Decision Notice(s); as there was no Building Control requirement to capture grey water, such a Condition would be unreasonable; there was agreement in principle for the development to discharge into Gloucestershire County Council's highway drain and the existing watercourse and not to connect to the foul water main, which was a concern of a number of Objectors, and outflow would be controlled/attenuated; in its determination of this application, the Committee should consider if it would be reasonable to refuse permission for reasons relating to drainage when the Council's technical

consultee had stated that the impact of the development over the existing problems would be negligible; the proposal was for overland water flow to be diverted into swales and for discharge to be controlled/attenuated; currently, the Council sought a 50% affordable housing contribution from developments; however, the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) encouraged the delivery of smaller housing sites and imposed a 'smaller sites' threshold in respect of affordable housing and tariff-style S106 contributions; the Applicant had arranged a public consultation event which had been viewed by the local community as a presentation rather than engagement; information on rainfall at this site was contained in the submitted Flood Risk Assessment; in its determination of this application, the Committee should consider whether the proposal would have a negative, positive or neutral impact on drainage; and, in the opinion of the Applicant, it would result in a degree of betterment due to the control of drainage across the site but that view was not shared by the Objectors.

A number of Members considered that this application should be refused. Those Members expressed concern that the existing foul water and sewage drainage systems were frequently overwhelmed at times of peak rainfall, leading to problems for residents and incidents of flooding and they suggested that this application would exacerbate that situation. The Members also expressed concerns over issues relating to affordability; a lack of a contribution in relation to affordable housing, despite the NPPG; and the potential impact on flooding elsewhere in the village. One Member also expressed concerns over issues relating to design, access and layout, and stated that he would regret the loss of any element of the existing hedgerow. Some other Members reminded the Committee that Thames Water considered the 1% increase in foul waste which would be generated by this development to be acceptable, and that the assessment by Thames Water included an allowance for all water generated by the development, including effluent.

A Proposition, that this application be refused for reasons relating to drainage, was duly Seconded.

The Ward Member was invited to address the Committee again. The Ward Member welcomed the degree of attention given by the Committee in its consideration of this application, and reiterated his view that this was not the correct site for the proposed development.

**Refused, for reasons relating to drainage.**

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

Note:

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

**CT.5331/D**

**Outline application with all matters reserved except access for the construction of up to 92 dwellings (with up to 50% affordable housing) and associated works at land off Berkeley Close, South Cerney -**

The Case Officer drew attention to the additional 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 proximity of the site to existing dwellings, a business park, a primary school and the County boundary; access; other land in the ownership of the Applicant; and the location of the site outside the Flood Zone. The Case Officer displayed photographs illustrating views along Berkeley Close and from within the site.

A Member of the Parish Council, 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 and referred to concerns raised by the Parish Council and residents in relation to the report submitted by Planning Prospects. The Ward Member commented that, while Planning Prospects had given an assurance that they would comply with all the conditions required by Thames Water regarding sewage leaving the site, they had not taken any responsibility for discharge from the Shorncote Sewage Works to Shire Ditch. The Ward Member commented that discharge from waste water treatment works was subject to control by an agreement and/or consent between Thames Water as sewage undertaker and the Environment Agency, with the sewage undertaker managing its consents with the Environment Agency and to ensure that its treatment works stayed within their consent parameters. The Ward Member contended that the proposed development could not reasonably be considered to have a significant and unmanageable influence on a waste water treatment works and its ability to operate within Environment Agency limits. The Ward Member stated that the Environment Agency had not made any further response to that to which she had referred at the Committee's Meeting on 9<sup>th</sup> November 2016, and she expressed her concern at the response received, and questioned if the Council was supposed to be content with that consultation. The Ward Member stated that it was estimated that 1.5m litres of water could be generated by 92 homes each year, and commented that such water would be treated at Shorncote and discharged into the Shire Ditch which, she considered, to be the source of flooding in the village. She reminded the Committee that South Cerney had a high water table and contended that the intention was to mitigate flooding through a SUDs strategy. The Ward Member quoted from the Thames Water Drainage Strategy for South Cerney, and expressed her view that the application was very much in the red 'high risk' area. The Ward Member reminded the Committee that, while SUDs dealt with groundwater, South Cerney experienced water rising up from, and moving, beneath the surface. The Ward Member stated that the proposed units on this site would be one metre higher than the existing units in Berkeley Close and The Leaze, and referred to the photographic evidence of water flow results that had been submitted. The Ward Member contended that, despite reassurances from Planning Prospects, there would be an increase in flood risk for the rest of the village. The Ward Member reminded the Committee that this site had been identified in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) as being suitable for a development comprising up to 64 dwellings, but had not been progressed due to limitations on access. The Ward Member stated that the site was outside the Development Boundary for the village

and that the village had not been identified as a strategic site in the emerging Local Plan. The Ward Member further contended that this was not the right site, in the right place, at the right time and, in conclusion, she stated that aside from the flooding issues, the field was prone to emitting methane gas fumes from an old landfill site.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that, in the vast majority of cases, Planning Inspectors came down on the side of technical experts at appeal; no objections had been received from the Land Contamination Officer, subject to conditions requiring the submission of additional information; in its determination of this application, the Committee should not consider the impact of any potential, future applications on flooding in this area; the site was not in a Flood Zone; as the flooding incidents referred to had been caused by temporary blockages, it was considered that this development would not exacerbate that situation; the site was relatively flat and the change in levels were considered to be negligible; the density of the proposed development was 28 units per ha, which was below the 30 units per ha proposed in the emerging Local Plan; this was an outline application with all matters apart from access being reserved; in the opinion of Officers, the proposed number of units should be able to be accommodated in a satisfactory manner, with roads being constructed to an adoptable standard and sufficient amenity and parking space, and access by emergency vehicles; it was proposed that there would be one point of access to the development off Broadway Lane; the County Highways Officer had not raised any objections in terms of trip generation; in its determination of this application, the Committee should only attach minimal weight to the emerging Local Plan, and should approve this application as recommended if it was deemed to be sustainable; and the weight that could be attached to the emerging Local Plan in the determination of applications would increase in accordance with the progress of the Plan towards formal adoption.

Some Members considered that this application did not accord with current policies or the emerging Local Plan. Those Members expressed concern over issues relating to density, access and drainage, and one Member commented that the proposal would be detrimental to the character of the village.

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

A Member commented that, if the Committee was minded to approve this application as recommended, the concerns in relation to drainage could be addressed through Conditions. Another Member reminded the Committee that the proposal was for 50% affordable housing. Notwithstanding that provision, the Member expressed support for the concerns highlighted, commenting that the existing sewage system was already overloaded and prone to flooding, and that it was unlikely the further improvement works required would be undertaken before 2020.

The Ward Member was invited to address the Committee again, and referred to comments made by David Gladman at a recent High Court case in Birmingham, which had been reported in the national Press. The Ward Member stated that the Cotswold District should not be victims of the development strategy Mr. Gladman had referred to. She reminded the Committee that the Council currently had a robust supply of housing land, and that the emerging Local Plan was progressing towards examination. The Ward Member considered that there were robust reasons to refuse this application and she urged the Committee to refuse it. In



conclusion, she stated that a decision on the Kingham application referred to had been deferred for further information in respect of flooding.

**Refused, for reasons relating to impact on density and foul and surface water drainage issues.**

**Record of Voting - for 13, against 0, abstentions 1, Ward Member unable to vote 1, absent 0.**

Note:

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

**CD.1236/1/F**

**Erection of two detached self-catering holiday accommodation buildings, revised access and parking area and other works at land rear of The Inn at Fossebridge, Fossebridge, Chedworth -**

The Planning and Development Manager suggested that, following receipt of amended drawings, consideration of this application should be deferred to allow time for Officers to re-consult on those drawings. He further suggested that the Committee should consider if it wished to undertake an advance Sites Inspection Briefing prior to its consideration of this application and that, in the event that the Committee was minded to defer this application, the public speakers and Ward Member should be given the opportunity to address the Committee in the first instance.

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

The Ward Member, who served on the Committee, was invited to address the Committee requested Members to bear in mind the suggested refusal reasons in the event that the Committee decided to carry out an advance Sites Inspection Briefing in respect of this application. The Ward Member explained that the site was in close proximity to other holiday accommodation units, a public house, and other businesses. The Ward Member considered Chedworth to be a thriving, sustainable community with a number of facilities, in a popular tourist area, and she reminded the Committee that this application proposed holiday accommodation for disabled people. The site was in close proximity to a Listed Building and the Ward Member pointed out that no objections in that respect had been submitted by the Council's Landscape Officer or the Cotswolds Conservation Board. The Ward Member considered the design of the proposed units to be sympathetic, and she reminded the Committee that it would enable restoration of an existing lake. The Ward Member reiterated that there was other holiday accommodation available in the vicinity and, in conclusion, stated that the Applicants had endeavoured to keep all lines of communication with Officers open and had sought to address all of the issues raised.

A Proposition, that consideration of this application be deferred for re-consultation on the amended plans, and for a Sites Inspection Briefing, was duly Seconded.

**Deferred for re-consultation on the amended plans, and for a Sites Inspection Briefing, to be undertaken by the Sites Inspection Briefing Panel,**

**to assess the impact on the locality, the Listed Building, the Conservation Area and the valley setting.**

**Record of Voting - for 13, against 0, abstentions 0, Ward Member unable to vote 1, absent (interest declared) 1.**

**CD.4049/1/M**

**Change use of Bourton Newsagent (use class A1) to a hot food takeaway (use class A5) at Windrush Restaurant, St. Kevins, High Street, Bourton-on-the-Water -**

The Case Officer drew attention to the extra representations received since the publication of the Schedule of Planning Applications, and displayed a photograph of the existing building.

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

The Ward Member, who did not serve on the Committee, was invited to address the Committee. The Ward Member amplified aspects of the reasons he had referred this application to the Committee for determination, and explained that this was the only shop in the West High Street that was regularly used by local residents, seventy of whom had attended a meeting to object to the loss of the newsagents. The Ward Member contended that the current use constituted a community facility in accordance with Local Plan Policy 32 and that the proposed Change of Use would result in the loss of a valuable community facility and service. The Ward Member expressed the hope that, if this application was refused, the premises would continue to be operated as a newsagent, and he contended that there was no need for another A5 outlet in the village. The Ward Member further contended that refusing this application would help to avoid problems of litter and odour that were sometimes associated with A5 outlets. The Ward Member stated that the current lease on the premises was due to expire in March 2017 and expressed the hope that the current owner would assign the lease to another newsagent. The Ward Member reiterated his view that a change of use to a fish and chip shop would create more litter, and could attract school children as customers which, he considered, could have an adverse impact on children's health. The Ward Member contended that some food outlets in the village opened during the tourist season only, and he concluded by stating that the village needed a full-time facility that would be of benefit to local residents.

In response to various questions by Members, it was reported that the newsagent was open between 8.00 a.m. and 5.30 p.m. each day of the week; the owner could choose to change the use of the premises to an alternative use within the current Use Class without any reference to the Council; alternative, potential uses for premises in an A1 Use Class included for hairdressing, travel agency and funeral directors; there was currently no requirement for premises in an A1 Use Class to be subjected to a rigorous marketing exercise in order to demonstrate viability; Bourton-on-the-Water was considered to be a specialist retail area which currently had few vacant shop premises; the Council's Environmental Health Officer had not raised any objections to the proposed Change of Use; and the remainder of the building was already in use as a fish and chip shop. Some Members expressed sympathy over the loss of the existing newsagents, but they pointed out that the Council was not able to restrict the use of these premises to that of a newsagent. Those Members considered it unreasonable to

penalise someone who was seeking to preserve a Listed Building and that this application presented an opportunity to attract another business to the village.

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

Other Members considered that the proposed Change of Use would not necessarily be of benefit to the local community. Those Members contended that it was important for the premises to be occupied by a business that was likely to serve the local community throughout the year; the loss of the current use constituted a loss of a community facility; the proposed use would have an adverse impact on the Listed Building; and refusal of this application could ensure that the future use of the premises was more appropriate to the needs of the local community.

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

On being put to the vote, the original Proposition, that this application be approved as recommended, was LOST. The Record of Voting in respect of that Proposition was - for 2, against 12, abstentions 1, absent 0.

**Refused, for reasons relating to the loss of an A1 Use and its contribution in that particular location to the vitality of the village.**

**Record of Voting - for 12, against 2, abstentions 1, absent 0.**

Note:

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

**CD.3390/V**

**Outline planning application for residential development (up to 16 dwellings) all matters reserved except access at land south of Gloucester Road, Andoversford -**

The Case Officer drew attention to the extra representations received since the publication of the Schedule of Planning Applications, and explained that Thames Water had confirmed that there were no capacity issues in respect of this application, subject to an extra Condition relating to the submission of a foul drainage strategy. The Case Officer also suggested that, if the Committee was minded to approve this application, as recommended, amended Conditions relating to highways and landscaping should be attached to any Decision Notice.

The Case Officer reminded the Committee of the location of this site and outlined the proposals, drawing attention to access; an illustrative layout; the proximity of the site to Listed Buildings and public rights of way; and its situation within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The Case Officer displayed an aerial photograph of the site, and photographs illustrating views along the highway, existing dwellings and a bus stop, and views into the site from various vantage points.

The Agent was invited to address the Committee.

The Ward Member, who did not serve on the Committee, was invited to address the Committee, and referred to the Sites Inspection Briefings undertaken in respect of this application. The Ward Member explained that this site had been identified as a potential development site some three years previously, but had subsequently been rejected by the Council's Forward Planning Team, and he considered that the reasons for that rejection were still relevant. The Ward Member contended that there was a potential, alternative development site in the village, which was located behind the Village Hall, and he reminded the Committee that the Parish Council had highway safety concerns over the development of this current site. The Ward Member expressed concerns over the location proposed for the access, which was in close proximity to a bend in the road and that it would be dangerous, particularly for pedestrians, including school children. The Ward Member referred to the objections submitted by the Campaign for the Protection of Rural England, and contended that the housing needs of the village to 2031 could be met through the development of alternative sites. The Ward Member further contended that this current proposal would have an adverse impact on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and a nearby bridleway, and would result in a prominent development which would have an urbanisation effect on this entrance to the village. In conclusion, the Ward Member stated that this application did not accord with the emerging Local Plan.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that, while landscaping was a reserved matter, an indicative plan had been submitted and, if the Committee was minded to approve this application as recommended, a Condition relating to landscaping could be attached to any Decision Notice(s); the County Highways Officer had not objected to this application, subject to a Condition requiring details of dropped kerbs and tactile paving amongst other improvements; there was an existing bus stop on the opposite side of the road to this site, in the vicinity of the existing Crossfields development; Gloucestershire County Council would address any issues relating to obstruction of the highway; the Cotswolds Conservation Board had not responded to the consultation in respect of this application; and there was no objection to the access as proposed in respect of unit 16.

Some Members expressed concern over the potential adverse impact of this proposal on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the unresolved highways issues. Concern was also expressed that removal of a section of the existing hedge would open up views to the housing development opposite this site, resulting in an urbanisation of this approach to the village, and that it was likely that the majority of occupants of the houses would use their private vehicles to travel to work. Another Member pointed out that this application was for a small-scale residential development in a sustainable location, which would provide 50% affordable housing and a financial contribution to education.

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

**Refused, for reasons relating to the adverse impact on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.**

**Record of Voting - for 9, against 3, abstentions 2, absent 1.**

Note:

Notwithstanding the positive benefits that would accrue from this development, this decision was contrary to the Officer recommendation, for the reasons stated.

PL.88 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 11, against 3, abstentions 1, absent 0.**

PL.89 SCHEDULE OF APPLICATIONS (CONTINUED)

**RESOLVED that the remaining applications be dealt with in accordance with Minute PL.87 above:-**

**CT.4316/F****Erection of a detached dwelling-house at 54 West Street, Tetbury -**

The Case Officer drew attention to the extra representations received since the publication of the Schedule of Planning Applications, including one further drawing for clarification at the request of Members at the site visit. The Case Officer reminded the Committee of the location of this site and outlined the proposals, drawing attention to the elevations of the proposed building. The Case Officer displayed an aerial photograph of the site, and photographs illustrating West Street, the existing wall and surrounding properties, and views of the rear of the existing 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, and expressed her view that this proposal would constitute major building works on a restricted plot, which would cause problems in the surrounding area. The Ward Member contended that West Street was used as a 'rat run' by motorists, who paid no regard to residents. The Ward Member reminded the Committee that no on-site parking was proposed in respect of this application, and stated that it would result in a reduction of the already-limited amount of on-street parking available in the area and that service vehicles would exacerbate the existing situation. The Ward Member contended that this proposal was not sustainable and pointed out that it would not make any contribution in respect of affordable housing. The Ward Member further contended that the Committee was not in a position to approve this application because, in her opinion, a number of details were still unclear and, in conclusion, she expressed her view that it constituted garden grabbing and was unnecessary.

The Chairman referred to the Sites Inspection Briefing undertaken in respect of this application, and he invited those Members who had attended that Briefing to express their views. A majority of those Members considered the proposal constituted an insensitive infill, which would have an adverse impact on the street scene, adjacent properties and views through the site. One Member suggested that conversion of the existing single-storey building below the level of the wall might constitute an acceptable solution.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that the existing wall was 4 feet 8 inches in height; the County Highways Officer had not objected to this proposal; the site was in close proximity to a public car park and within

walking distance of various town centre facilities; in the opinion of Officers, the proposal would not have any significant, adverse impact on the character and appearance of West Street, and that views through the existing gap were not important in the street scene; and the site would not be overlooked from principal rooms in either of the adjacent residential properties.

A number of Members considered that this site was in the only open part of West Street and that the 'blankness' of existing buildings should not be perpetuated in this area. Those Members also expressed concern over the lack of off-street parking. A Member commented that this was a valuable space in a street where the existing houses were of different sizes, and suggested that a single-storey building below the level of the existing wall might be acceptable in this location. Another Member referred to the lack of off-street parking, loss of views across the valley through the gap and disruption caused by building works, and suggested that the loss of this open space would have an adverse impact on the Conservation Area.

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

**Refused, for reasons relating to the adverse impact on the Conservation Area and character of West Street.**

**Record of Voting - for 13, against 0, abstentions 1, Ward Member unable to vote 1, absent 0.**

Note:

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

**CD.9552**

**Development of an equestrian rehabilitation unit, including the construction of an American barn incorporating stables, treatment rooms and a staff flat, a hay and machinery store, a horse walker, lunge pen and 60m x 30m sand school and change of use of land from agriculture to the keeping of horses at land north of Far Heath Farm, Evenlode -**

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 its situation within the Moreton-in-Marsh Special Landscape Area; its proximity to Evenlode and the District boundary; and the proposed layout. The Case Officer displayed an aerial view of the site and photographs illustrating the access, existing boundary and vegetation, and views into the site.

One of the Applicants was invited to address the Committee.

The Ward Member, who did not serve on the Committee, was invited to address the Committee, and expressed the view that the business case presented in relation to this application was significant. The Ward Member commented that the Applicants had taken time to establish their existing business in Bourton-on-the-

Water, and that there was no equivalent operation to this current proposal anywhere else in the District. The Ward Member further commented that the proposal had been supported by a number of professional people, and contended that refusal due to the potential adverse impact on the Special Landscape Area would be subjective as the site was part of a much larger land holding. The Ward Member concluded by suggesting that consideration of this application be deferred for a Sites Inspection Briefing.

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

Another Proposition, that this application be approved subject to conditions, was also Seconded but the Secunder subsequently withdrew his support for that further Proposition.

**Deferred for a Sites Inspection Briefing, to be undertaken by all Members of the Committee as an approved duty, to assess the impact on the Special Landscape Area.**

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

Note:

It was considered appropriate for all Members of the Committee to be invited to attend this Sites Inspection Briefing in order to assess the impact of the proposal on a sensitive landscape.

**CD.9559**

**Creation of equestrian yard and manege with associated access and landscaping at land east of Evenlode Road, Evenlode -**

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 situation in the Moreton-in-Marsh Special Landscape Area and access. The Case Officer displayed an aerial photograph of the site, and photographs illustrating a photo montage of the proposed building, and views into and from within the site.

The Applicant was invited to address the Committee.

The Ward Member, who did not serve on the Committee, was invited to address the Committee, and commented that this application constituted a different type of activity to the previous application (CD.9552 above referred). The Ward Member concluded by reminding the Committee that the Officer view was that the harm to the Special Landscape Area would not be outweighed from any benefits accruing from this application.

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

**Deferred for a Sites Inspection Briefing, to be undertaken by all Members of the Committee as an approved duty, to assess the impact on the Special Landscape Area.**

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

It was considered appropriate for all Members of the Committee to be invited to attend this Sites Inspection Briefing in order to assess the impact of the proposal on a sensitive landscape.

**CD.4931/2/J****Use of land for outdoor pursuits associated with existing leisure uses on site at Farncombe Estate, Willersey Hill, Willersey -**

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 proximity of a golf course to the south-east of the site; the extent of the Farncombe Estate; the proposed activities; and existing holiday/recreational uses within the Estate. The Case Officer displayed an aerial photograph of the site, and photographs illustrating views from within and across the site.

A Representative of the Parish Council, an Objector and the Agent were invited to address the Committee.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that the Applicant was seeking a permanent solution to this application; and that a number of activities had been carried out in association with the previous occupation of the site.

Some Members considered that this application should be approved as recommended as, in their opinion, the proposed leisure uses would be low-key and self-regulating.

A Proposition, that if the Committee was minded to approve this application clay pigeon shooting should be restricted to a maximum of two hours at a time, was duly Seconded.

Note:

*On being put to the vote, that Proposition was carried. The Record of Voting in respect of that Proposition was - for 8 (including the Chairman's Casting Vote), against 7, abstentions 1, absent 0.*

*An equality of votes was cast and the Chairman was invited to consider using his Casting Vote. The Chairman exercised such Vote in favour of the Proposition to restrict the length of time allowed for clay pigeon shooting.*

A Member commented that no restrictions had been proposed in relation to quad biking activities, and expressed the view that light pollution arising from the site at night could have an adverse effect on the village. In response, it was reported that, in the view of Officers, quad biking activities were not deemed to be harmful and that, in the event the Committee was minded to approve this application as



recommended, a Condition requiring all quad bikes to be fitted with a silencer would be attached to any Decision Notice.

A Member expressed the view that the Council must be reasonable in its approach to noise levels arising from activities carried out on this site. The Member referred to the existing business on this site, and contended that the economic benefits accruing from the proposed supervised leisure activities would outweigh any harm. However, the Member suggested that, if the Committee was minded to approve this application, such permission should be for a temporary period of two years in order to allow time for any complaints to be validated, and a Proposition to that effect 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 9, abstentions 0, absent 0.

Two further Propositions, that this application be refused, and that consideration of this application be deferred for a Sites Inspection Briefing, were duly Seconded. On being put to the vote, the first further Proposition, that this application be refused, was CARRIED.

**Refused, for reasons relating to the adverse impact of the proposals on the tranquillity of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.**

**Record of Voting - for 8, against 7, abstentions 0, absent 0.**

Note:

This decision was contrary to the Officer recommendation, for the reasons stated.

**CD.2288/W**

**Erection of a bungalow at land adjacent to Tops Nursery, Broadway Road, Mickleton -**

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 situation outside the Development Boundary for the village and the locations within the site of other, recently-permitted, and existing developments. The Case Officer displayed an aerial photograph of the site, and photographs illustrating Broadway Road and an existing single-storey stone building, and views into the site.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that this site was not located within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty; in the opinion of Officers, the proposal would not have any significant, demonstrable adverse impact on the area; the Officer recommendation had been made following an assessment of the application, and had been based on the merits of that application; it was unlikely that a two-storey development would be appropriate in this location; access to the site would be via the access to the existing nursery; each application should be judged on its merits; this was a 'brown field' site; and there was no justification for requiring a master plan in respect of development on this site.

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

**Approved, as recommended.**

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

**CT.8879/B**

**Change of Use of barn to dwelling, single storey lean-to extension, access track and associated site works at Shepherd's Barn, Syde Park Farm, Caudle Green -**

The Case Officer reported that no formal response had been received from the Parish Council in respect of this application. The Case Officer reminded the Committee of the location of this site and outlined the proposals, drawing attention to an illustrative layout and elevations. The Case Officer displayed an aerial photograph of the site and photographs of the existing barn, together with photographs submitted by the Ward Member illustrating views of the site from various public vantage points. The Case Officer commented that the barn constituted a non-designated heritage asset and that it was considered that the benefits of the proposed conversion would outweigh any adverse impact.

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

The Ward Member, who did not serve on the Committee, was invited to address the Committee, and he commented that the property was visible from various public vantage points from the north and south of the site. The Ward Member emphasised the surprise expressed by residents to the change in Officer advice in respect of previous applications on this site in 2011 and 2015 and this current application. The Ward Member reminded the Committee that the Officer recommendations in relation to the two previous applications had been for refusal, while the recommendation in relation to this current application was to permit. The Ward Member referred to the refusal reason relating to the two previous applications, and stated that the Officer report in relation to this current application considered the proposal to be smaller in size and that it would preserve a non-designated heritage asset. The Ward Member concluded by stating that residents hoped the Committee would consider how a new, isolated dwelling in the open countryside could conserve or enhance the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

Note:

*At this juncture, having previously declared an interest in this item, the Ward Member left the Meeting.*

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that the 2015 application had proposed a two-storey gable extension to the western elevation of the barn, which also required a staircase, a larger curtilage and a different access route; in the opinion of Officers, the benefits of that previous application would not have been outweighed by the adverse impact on the non-designated heritage asset; the current proposal would be less visible in the landscape than that previous proposal; the proposed extension was considered to be proportionate and sympathetic with the existing barn, and accorded with policy; the proposed extension would not be required to facilitate the Change of Use of the barn; the proposal was for a smaller curtilage, with parking to the rear of the barn; it was considered that the proposed access would have minimal visibility in the wider

landscape and would help to sustain the viability of the non-designated heritage asset and the character of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty; it was considered that the proposed flue would not be detrimental to the character of the barn; it was considered that the proposal would not result in any significant light impact; the barn would be capable of conversion without the proposed lean-to extension; the barn was currently redundant; the proposal was for an open market dwelling; and it was not considered to be reasonable or necessary to attach an agricultural occupancy condition to any Decision Notice;

Some Members considered that this application to be contrary to policy. Those Members contended that the proposal would have an adverse impact on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and would not enhance the existing barn, and that, in their opinion, the design as submitted was neither outstanding nor innovative.

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

Other Members considered that this application should be approved, as recommended, and another Proposition to that effect was duly Seconded.

**Refused, for reasons relating to the adverse impact on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.**

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

Notes:

(i) This decision was contrary to the Officer recommendation, for the reasons stated.

(ii) Councillor David Fowles requested that it be recorded that he was disappointed that the Ward Member and his Wife had been subjected to unreasonable comments.

**CD.0230/1/C**

**Blocking up of existing vehicular opening and creation of replacement opening and gates at Park House, Maugersbury -**

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 elevations and design. The Case Officer displayed an aerial photograph of the site, and photographs illustrating the access, the area of wall proposed for demolition, and the context of the wall.

The Applicant and Agent 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 had visited the site to review the proposed alterations in respect of an existing right of way through the property for residents of the adjacent Maugersbury Manor. The Ward Member explained that, currently, the Applicant was required to move any vehicles parked on his driveway if access was required to the right of way, which ran immediately adjacent to the fence separating the Applicant's garden from a paddock. The Ward Member suggested

that the access through the wall of the Manor house probably dated from the 1950s, and explained that it opened onto a lawn which was immediately adjacent to the Manor house. The current right of way was across grassland, and the Ward Member explained that there was nothing to prevent the area being churned up by vehicles. The Ward Member contended that the current proposal seemed to be entirely sensible, and explained that the new right of way would start from an existing gate into the field, continue around the far side of that field, away from the Applicant's house, and through a new opening to be created in the wall of the Manor house, but at a greater distance from the Manor house than the existing opening. The Ward Member considered the proposal would be of benefit to both the Applicant and the occupants of the Manor house and that bricks from the proposed demolition would be salvaged and used to block up the existing opening in the wall. The Ward Member supported the use of 'grid force', a mesh track which would be laid along the route of the proposed right of way and would be hidden when the grass grew, but would prevent damage to the field. The Ward Member considered that vehicles using the right of way would be screened from the road by an existing field and hedgerow, and she quoted from the conclusions of a heritage assessment carried out at the site. The Ward Member reminded the Committee that the roots of existing trees would be protected, and that the Applicant had proposed the planting of additional trees of native species to further screen the new right of way. The Ward Member stated that the Applicant had consulted the Parish Council and the occupiers of neighbouring properties, including the Manor house, all of whom had supported the proposal. The Ward Member expressed her support for the proposal and concluded by urging the Committee to approve this application.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that there was an alternative access available from the road to the front of the Manor house; an application had been submitted seeking permission to make improvements to the existing side access to the Manor house; there was a viable alternative to provide an amended access to the Manor house which would not necessitate any loss of historic fabric.

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

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

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

Some Members considered the right of way to be a legal issue which could be agreed between the relevant parties, and that there was a viable alternative for providing access to the Manor house which, if approved, could result in the right of way being retained.

**Refused, as recommended.**

**Record of Voting - for 7 (including the Chairman's Casting Vote), against 6, abstentions 0, absent 3.**

Note:

An equality of votes was cast and the Chairman was invited to consider using his Casting Vote. The Chairman exercised such Vote in favour of the Proposition to refuse this application, as recommended.

**CD.0230/1/B****Proposed construction of new access and track, blocking up existing opening and creation of new opening including gates at Park House, Mangersbury -**

The Case Officer reminded the Committee of the location of this site and outlined the proposals, drawing attention to a secondary access to the Manor house and materials. The Case Officer displayed an aerial photograph of the site, and photographs illustrating the existing and proposed routes of the right of way; the route of the proposed access track, the existing access to the Manor house and views across the parkland.

The Applicant and Agent were invited to address the Committee but explained that they had made all of their representations in relation to the previous application (application CD.0230/1/C above referred).

There were no further comments from the Ward Member.

In response to a question from a Member, it was reported that impact on the Listed Building was a material consideration in the determination of the planning application.

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

**Refused, as recommended.**

**Record of Voting - for 6, against 5, abstentions 1, absent 3.**

**CT.9171****Single-storey extension at 14 Hatherop, Cirencester -**

The Team Leader reminded the Committee of the location of this site and outlined the proposals, drawing attention to the proposed elevations. The Team Leader displayed photographs illustrating views of numbers 14, 15, 21 and 22 Hatherop.

The Applicant was 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's comments had been included in the circulated report, and he requested that such comments be read out to the Committee. The Ward Member concluded by suggesting that consideration of this application be deferred for a Sites Inspection Briefing.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that this was a restricted site; the application proposed an extension to the front of the property; and the other houses in the group which had been extended, had extensions to the side.

A Member expressed the view that this was a small cottage and commented that some of the other cottages in the group had already been extended.

A Proposition, that this application be approved, was duly Seconded. On being put to the vote, that Proposition was LOST. The Record of Voting in respect of that Proposition was - for 2, against 8, abstentions 1, interest declared 1, absent 3.

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

**Deferred for a Sites Inspection Briefing, to be undertaken by all Members of the Committee as an approved duty, to assess the impact of the proposal on the nearby Listed Building, the Conservation Area and the existing cottages.**

**Record of Voting - for 9, against 0, abstentions 2, interest declared 1, absent 3.**

Note:

It was considered appropriate for all Members of the Committee to be invited to attend this Sites Inspection Briefing in order to assess the impact of the proposal on the Conservation Area.

**CT.4921/K**

**Retrospective Change of Use of ancillary outbuilding to self-contained flat at Winstone Glebe, Notch Road, Winstone -**

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 Case Officer displayed an aerial view of the site and photographs illustrating the access, the Listed Buildings, Winstone Glebe and the outbuilding which had been converted.

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

**Approved, as recommended.**

**Record of Voting - for 10, against 1, abstentions 1, absent 3.**

**CT.4936/1/C**

**Extension to the south elevation and partial loft conversion, including a roof dormer to the front and increasing a section of the main ridge height to match the existing at The Close, The Croft, 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 outlined the proposals, drawing attention to the differences between this current scheme and that which had been refused in August 2016. The Case Officer reported that the Town Council had no objections to this proposal and he suggested that, if the Committee was minded to approve this application as recommended, the Condition removing Permitted Development Rights in respect of windows should be deleted. The Case Officer displayed an aerial photograph of the site, and photographs illustrating the

existing bungalow on the site, the adjacent Listed Building and the relationship between the bungalow and the adjacent Listed Building.

The Ward Member, who served on the Committee, was invited to address the Committee and explained that she had referred this application to the Committee for determination because she was not confident that the Applicant had given due consideration to the Committee's comments when the previous application had been refused in August 2016. The Ward Member concluded by questioning if this proposal was appropriate for a bungalow located in a Conservation Area and adjacent to a Listed Building.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that the Listed Building was situated to the north of this site; the proposed extension would be situated to the south of the existing bungalow; and, if the Committee was minded to approve this application, it would result in a small increase in the footprint of the existing bungalow.

A number of Members expressed support for this application. Those Members considered that this proposal would not have any detrimental impact on the adjacent Listed Building as no change was being proposed in relation to the ridge height closest to that Listed Building.

A Proposition, that this application be approved as recommended subject to deletion of the Condition relating to removal of Permitted Development Rights in respect of windows, was duly Seconded.

**Approved, as recommended, subject to the deletion of the Condition relating to removal of Permitted Development Rights in respect of windows.**

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

**CT.1737/D**

**Removal of Condition B restricting the use to the applicant and Condition E restricting the operation to the keeping of 10 cats at any one time, of Planning Application No: CT.1737/B dated 18th May 1988 for the erection of a building to be used as a cattery, alterations to the existing vehicular access at 33 Tetbury Hill, Avening -**

The Team Leader reminded the Committee of the location of this site and outlined the proposals.

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

**Approved, as recommended.**

**Record of Voting - for 10, against 0, abstentions 1, absent 3.**

**CT.3828/1/P**

**Change of Use to B1/D1 and health/beauty/exercise related uses at 44 Black Jack Street, Cirencester -**

The Team Leader reminded the Committee of the location of this site.

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

**Approved, as recommended.**

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

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 CT.9103.

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

Councillor Julian Beale was invited to speak on applications CD.9552 and CD.9559.

Councillor RL Hughes was invited to speak on application CD.3390/V.

Councillor NJW Parsons was invited to speak on application CT.8879/B.

Councillor RL Wilkins was invited to speak on application CD.4049/1/M.

(iii) Public Speaking

Public speaking took place as follows:-

<u>CT.9103</u>	)	Councillor C Davies (Parish Council)
	)	Mr. S Smith (Objector)
	)	Mr. M Travis (Agent)
<u>CT.5331/D</u>	)	Councillor P Nicholas (Parish Council)
	)	Miss R Tolhurst (Objector)
	)	Mr. J Tait (Agent)
<u>CD.1236/1/F</u>	)	Mrs. A Parsons (Objector)
	)	Mrs. D Ludlow (Supporter)
	)	Mr. A Pywell (Agent) *
	)	Ms C Quick (Applicant) *
<u>CD.4049/1/M</u>	)	Councillor R Hadley (Parish Council)
	)	Dr. Jeans (Objector)
	)	Mr. D Jones (Agent)
<u>CD.3390/V</u>	)	Ms L Allison (Agent)
<u>CT.4316/F</u>	)	Ms L Brain (Objector)
	)	Mr. R Bradbeer (Agent)



<u>CD.9552</u>	)	Mr. T Campbell (Applicant)
<u>CD.9559</u>	)	Mr. B Wharfe (Applicant)
<u>CD.4931/2/J</u>	)	Mr. B Jabelman (on behalf of the
	)	Parish Council)
	)	Mr. P Lankester (Objector)
	)	Mr. D Jones (Agent)
<u>CT.8879/B</u>	)	Mr. R Beale (Objector)
	)	Ms L Hall (Agent)
<u>CD.0230/1/C</u>	)	Mr. S Meyrick (Applicant) *
	)	Mr. N Worlledge (Agent) *
<u>CD.0230/1/B</u>	)	Mr. S Meyrick (Applicant) *
	)	Mr. N Worlledge (Agent) *
<u>CT.9171</u>	)	Mr. R List (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.90 SITES INSPECTION BRIEFINGS

1. Members for 4<sup>th</sup> January 2017

It was noted that Councillors PCB Coleman, Mrs. SL Jepson, Juliet Layton and MGE MacKenzie-Charrington, together with the Chairman, would represent the Committee at the Sites Inspection Briefing on Wednesday 4<sup>th</sup> January 2017.

2. Advance Sites Inspection Briefings

It was noted that an advance Sites Inspection Briefing would take place on Wednesday 4<sup>th</sup> January 2017 in respect of the following application:-

16/00833/OUT- outline application for the erection of up to 4 dwellings on land north of Campden Lane, Willersey - to assess the impact of the proposal on the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the amenity of neighbours within the Willersey Conservation Area.

Note:

All Members of the Committee were invited to attend this Sites Inspection Briefing as an approved duty, because it was considered to be a controversial application and that the Committee needed to obtain an appreciation of the context, including in relation to drainage, and the impact on the village.

PL.91 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., between 1.00 p.m. and 1.15 p.m. and between 3.20 p.m. and 3.30 p.m., and closed at 5.15 p.m.

Chairman

(END)