

COTSWOLD DISTRICT COUNCIL

PLANNING AND LICENSING COMMITTEE

11TH JANUARY 2017

Present:

Councillor SG Hirst - Chairman
Councillor Tina Stevenson - Vice-Chairman

Councillors -

| | |
|----------------|---------------------------|
| AW Berry | David Fowles |
| AR Brassington | M Harris |
| Alison Coggins | RL Hughes |
| PCB Coleman | Mrs. SL Jepson |
| RW Dutton | Juliet Layton |
| Jenny Forde | MGE MacKenzie-Charrington |

Substitutes:

Julian Beale

Apologies:

Sue Coakley (absent on other
Council business)

PL.92 APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIRMAN

The Chairman invited nominations.

Councillor Juliet Layton was Proposed by Councillor PCB Coleman and Seconded by Councillor Jenny Forde

Councillor Tina Stevenson was Proposed by Councillor Mrs. SL Jepson and Seconded by Councillor RL Hughes.

Following a vote, it was

RESOLVED that Councillor Tina Stevenson be appointed Vice-Chairman of the Committee, for the remainder of the 2016/17 Council Year.

PL.93 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

(1) Member Declarations

Councillor David Fowles declared an interest in respect of application CD.1236/1/E, because he was acquainted with the Agent, 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.
 Councillor M Harris declared an interest in respect of application CT.9171, because he was acquainted with the Applicant.

Councillor MGE MacKenzie-Charrington declared a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in respect of application CD.2518/G, because he was the Applicant, and he left the Meeting while that item was being determined.

(2) Officer Declarations

There were no declarations of interest from Officers.

PL.94 SUBSTITUTION ARRANGEMENTS

Councillor Julian Beale substituted for Councillor Sue Coakley.

PL.95 MINUTES

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the Meeting of the Committee held on 14th December 2016 be approved as a correct record.

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

Arising thereon:

(i) Public Questions (PL.81)

Further to Minute PL.71 of 14th December 2016, a Member commented that, to date, written responses in respect of the second, third and fourth public questions asked at the Meeting of the Committee held on 9th November 2016 had not been forwarded to all Members. The Member requested that this situation be rectified.

(ii) Schedule of Applications - Outline Application etc. at Land East of Bell Lane, Poulton (CT.9103) (PL.87) (Page 113)

In response to various third party representations regarding the accuracy of wording of the Minute and Decision Notice in respect of this application, it was reported that the Chairman and senior Officers had listened to the Council's recording of that part of the Committee's previous Meeting when this application had been determined, and were satisfied that the wording of both the Minutes and Decision Notice constituted an accurate reflection of the Committee's discussions and subsequent decision.

A number of issues had been raised during the debate on this item, which had been honed into a single refusal reason relating to drainage. In response to questions from the Ward Member, it was reported that the Applicant could lodge an appeal against the Committee's decision and/or re-submit the application. In determining an appeal, the Inspector could decide to allow or dismiss the appeal, and the Inspector's dismissal of an appeal could be for different reasons to those stated in the refusal by the Council. The Council could be faced with a claim for costs if it could not defend its refusal reasons, even if an appeal was dismissed. If a further application was submitted, the Committee could consider the impact of the revised scheme and, if it was minded to refuse that application, such decision

could be based on different/additional refusal reasons if it was reasonable to do so.

In the ensuing discussion, issues were raised regarding the process for the issue of Decision Notices and the way in which the Committee dealt with propositions that were contrary to Officer recommendations. In respect of the latter issue, the Chairman outlined a procedure, which he intended to introduce with immediate effect, whereby the Proposer would be requested to articulate the reasons for the contrary proposal, and the Proposer and Secunder would be requested to confirm their Proposition before a vote was taken. The Chairman explained that the Committee would be updated on the former issue, and other concerns raised during the debate including in relation to the wording of Conditions and Refusal Reasons, in due course, following discussions with Officers.

PL.96 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman referred to the procedure for dealing with propositions that were contrary to Officer recommendations.

PL.97 PUBLIC QUESTIONS

No public questions had been submitted.

PL.98 MEMBER QUESTIONS

No questions had been received from Members.

PL.99 PETITIONS

No petitions had been received.

PL.100 SCHEDULE OF APPLICATIONS

It was noted that the details of the policies referred to in the compilation of the Schedule did not comprise a comprehensive list of the policies taken into account in the preparation of the reports.

RESOLVED that:

(a) where on this Schedule of Applications, development proposals in Conservation Areas and/or affecting Listed Buildings have been advertised - (in accordance with Section 73 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Buildings in Conservation Areas) Regulations 1977) - but the period of the advertisement has not expired by the date of the Meeting then, if no further written representations raising new issues are received by the date of expiration of the advertisement, those applications shall be determined in accordance with the views of the Committee;

(b) where on this Schedule of Applications, the consultation period in respect of any proposals has not expired by the date of the Meeting then, if no further written representations raising new issues are received by the date of expiration of the consultation period, those applications shall be determined in accordance with the views of the Committee;

**(c) the applications in the Schedule be dealt with in accordance with the following resolutions:-
CD.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 reminded the Committee of the location of this site and outlined the proposals. The Case Officer displayed an aerial photograph of the site, and photographs illustrating views of the site from various vantage points and views from within the site.

The Agent was invited to address the Committee.

The Ward Member, who was serving on the Committee at this Meeting as a Substitute Member, was invited to address the Committee. The Ward Member contended that this proposal underpinned the Applicants' existing significant, well-established rural business and complementary equine veterinary practice. The Ward Member referred to the support for this current application from the local community, and pointed out that no objections had been received from the consultees. The Ward Member expressed his opinion that the development would constitute a carefully landscaped oasis of peace and calm, and would be of benefit to the area. The Ward Member stated that he supported this application and, in conclusion, he urged the Committee to approve it as, in his opinion, a substantial economic benefit would accrue to the area and the development would have a positive impact on the environment.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that, in the opinion of Officers, this proposal was contrary to Policy 31, it would not enhance the landscape and the potential economic benefits were outweighed by the adverse landscape impact; if the Committee was minded to approve this application, a condition relating to the colour of the roofing materials could be attached to the Decision Notice and any change of materials would require the submission of amended plans; the proposed buildings would be 6.7 metres and 7.2 metres high at the ridge lines; it was unlikely that an amended proposal for a single-storey building on this site would overcome Officer concerns in relation to the adverse landscape impact; equine and agricultural uses were distinct in planning law; in the opinion of Officers there were no exceptional reasons to approve an unrelated barn in the open countryside in this location; the site was in the Moreton-in-Marsh Special Landscape Area, and close to the boundary with Oxfordshire County Council, and that Special Landscape Area did not extend beyond the County boundary; the site was not visible from the A44; Officers supported the principle of the business but did not consider that the benefits accruing from this development would outweigh the adverse landscape impact; the Applicants were experienced in animal welfare issues and had put forward this site as being suitable for the development proposed; and no pre-application advice had been sought on this occasion.

Some Members expressed support in principle for an equestrian rehabilitation unit but they contended that this was not the appropriate location for such a unit. Those Members considered that the nature of the business and its location should be separated, and they contended that the built development would comprise

large, new structures in the open countryside, and raised concerns over other associated issues, such as access to the site by large horseboxes.

Other Members expressed their support for this application, and they contended that this was not an isolated site as there were other, existing buildings in the vicinity, and that the benefits accruing from the proposal would outweigh any adverse environmental impact. A Proposition, that it be approved subject to various conditions including lighting, materials, landscaping, future maintenance, occupancy, drainage and highways, was duly Seconded.

The Ward Member was invited to address the Committee again, and stated that this site was not visible from the A44. The Ward Member stated that there was an existing cattle stud in the vicinity of this site, which did not cause any highway problems, and he reminded the Committee that the proposed development would generate additional employment opportunities. The Ward Member contended that some economic benefit would accrue to suppliers of the unit, and he concluded by pointing out that the site had been identified by the Applicants as being suitable for the proposed development because of its tranquil setting.

On being put to the vote, that Proposition was LOST. The Record of Voting in respect of that Proposition was - for 4, against 10, abstentions 0, Ward Member unable to vote 1, absent 0.

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

Refused, as recommended.

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

CD.9559

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

The Case Officer reminded the Committee of the location of this site and outlined the proposals, drawing attention to other land in the Applicant's ownership and the location of the site in the Moreton-in-Marsh Special Landscape Area. The Case Officer displayed an aerial photograph of the site, and photographs illustrating views of the site from various vantage points, into the site and of the existing buildings on the site, and a photo montage of the proposed building.

The Agent was invited to address the Committee.

The Ward Member, who was serving on the Committee at this Meeting as a Substitute Member, was invited to address the Committee, and stated that the Applicant was dedicated to the area and wished to maintain his existing business contacts and to continue his contribution to 'local' life. The Ward Member reminded the Committee that, although the Parish Council had objected for reasons relating to size, suitability and security, no objections had been received from other consultees, and that the application had been supported by some of the Applicant's existing customers. The Ward Member stated that he recognised the risk and impact associated with this application, but expressed support for the proposal because of the economic and community benefits that would accrue. In

conclusion, the Ward Member contended that the proposal would have a modest impact on the countryside and the environment.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that this proposal was on a smaller scale to the proposal considered under the previous item on the Agenda (application CD.9552 referred); the Applicant wished to relocate an existing business; the site was in open countryside and so this application was contrary to policy; and the Applicant had sought pre-application advice.

While expressing support for rural and equine businesses, some Members considered that the Council had a duty to protect the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, and Special Landscape Areas, in line with policy. Those Members further considered that each application should be determined on its merits, and reminded the Committee of the national distinction between agricultural and equine uses. One Member referred to the volume of development proposed for Moreton-in-Marsh over the next few years, which was in close proximity to this site, and commented that the importance of Special Landscape Areas would increase in the face of such development. In response, the Chairman commented that the need for local employment would similarly increase. Another Member expressed concern over security issues at the site.

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

The Ward Member was invited to address the Committee again, and he stated that he agreed with the comment on security at this site. The Ward Member considered that villages would benefit from young families being resident and expanding businesses.

Refused, as recommended.

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

CD.4714/N

Outline application for the erection of up to 4 dwellings at land north of Campden Lane, Willersey -

The Case Officer drew attention to the extra representations received since 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 location in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty; its proximity to a public right of way; two other sites in the vicinity which had received permission for a total of eighty dwellings; indicative layouts; and wildlife buffers proposed along the northern and western boundaries. The Case Officer displayed an aerial photograph of the site, and photographs illustrating views into and from within the site, and trees proposed to be felled.

The Applicant was invited to address the Committee.

The Committee Services Manager read out comments received from one of the Ward Members who did not serve on the Committee and had been unable to

attend the Meeting. The Ward Member thanked the Committee for undertaking an advance Sites Inspection Briefing in relation to this application, and commented that Willersey had already been swamped by a number of major developments. The Ward Member concurred with the views expressed by the Parish Council that 'enough is enough', but contended that this was the sort of site he would prefer to see developed in village locations, if done sensitively, rather than big developments. In the event that the Committee was minded to approve this application, the Ward Member considered it imperative that the built development comprised a single 1.5 storey dwelling and three bungalows, with the ridge height of the 1.5 storey dwelling not exceeding the ridge heights of existing properties. The Ward Member further considered that the dwellings should be constructed using natural Cotswold stone and that any landscape screening should include an element of native hedging. In conclusion, the Ward Member suggested that Officers should address local concerns in relation to wildlife and, perhaps, seek a further, independent ecological survey.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that, while the Case Officer and Conservation Officer had expressed differing views on this application, the Officer recommendation was to refuse for reasons relating to landscape impact; the outline application was for a development comprising up to four dwellings; the illustrative plan indicated three footprints, which could deliver four dwellings; the application had been assessed on the basis that four dwellings would be constructed; if the Committee was minded to approve this application, a condition requiring the layout in any reserved matters application to accord with the indicative layout submitted could be attached to the Decision Notice; there was no planning history to indicate that approval had been given for a change of use from agriculture to equine in relation to this site; a horse could be grazed on the land without a change of use; the approach to the site was not considered to be agricultural; it was considered that the site could accommodate up to ten dwellings but its 'edge of settlement' location required a lower density; and the Applicant had indicated that, if the Committee was minded to approve this application, a condition restricting the ridge heights to 7.25 metres and 6 metres respectively, would be acceptable.

A Member expressed the view that this application would not have any detrimental impact on the existing settlement and a Proposition, that this application be approved subject to conditions relating to materials, ecological benefits, ridge heights, highways and the layout to accord with the illustrative layout, was duly Seconded.

Some Members expressed concern over issues relating to highway safety and the need to retain informal areas of open land, including in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Those Members expressed their support for the Officer recommendation. Other Members contended that single-storey dwellings in an 'edge of settlement' location would be an asset, particularly for existing residents who might be seeking to downsize. Those Members considered that villages wanted small-scale developments, and that there was a need for more open-market housing. One Member stated that there was an existing, similar development in the centre of the village.

Approved, subject to conditions to be specified by the Case Officer in relation to materials, ecological benefits, ridge heights, highways and the layout to accord with the illustrative layout.

Record of Voting - for 10, against 2, abstentions 3, absent 0.

Note:

This decision was contrary to the Officer recommendation because a majority of the Committee considered that this proposal would not have any detrimental impact on the existing settlement.

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 -

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 its proximity to the Inn at Fossebridge and a Grade II Listed Building to the west. The Case Officer displayed an aerial photograph of the site, photographs illustrating views of the site from various locations, and a photo montage submitted by the Applicants.

A Supporter, one of the Applicants, and a representative of the Applicants were invited to address the Committee.

The Chairman referred to the Sites Inspection Briefing, undertaken in respect of this application by the Sites Inspection Briefing Panel, and he invited those Members who had served on that Panel to express their views. Those Members considered that the proposed development would make a contribution to tourism in the area, and would not have any detrimental impact on existing buildings.

The Ward Member, who served on the Committee, was invited to address the Committee, and expressed the view that the Sites Inspection Briefing had been very helpful. The Ward Member disagreed with the Officer recommendation for refusal for reasons relating to sustainability. The Ward Member referred to other, existing holiday accommodation in the vicinity of this site, its proximity to the Inn at Fossebridge, its situation on a popular tourist route through the Cotswolds, and its proximity to a number of facilities in Chedworth. The Ward Member commented that this was a popular area for cyclists and that, in her opinion, it was not an unsustainable location. The Ward Member contended that the proposal would enhance a popular destination and would enable the area to thrive. In conclusion, the Ward Members reiterated her view that this was a sustainable site which would lead to an increase in tourism.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that, if the Committee was minded to approve this application, an application seeking removal of any condition restricting the use of the buildings to holiday lets could be submitted in the future, and that such an application would be determined on its merits; the proposed materials included elements of natural Cotswold stone; and the site was served by two buses per week to Cirencester, and by another service which stopped at the nearby bus stop on request.

A Member commented that the frequency of bus services should not be considered in relation to sustainability issues. Other Members considered that this proposal would not have any adverse impact on the Area of Outstanding

Natural Beauty and that the overall benefits of the proposal would outweigh any concerns. In response to a further question from a Member, it was reported that the Applicants could undertake works in respect of the de-silting of the lake and rebuilding of a weir without the need for planning permission, and that reference to such works had been included in the ecological survey, heritage asset statement and Flood Risk Assessment as a statement of the Applicants' intentions.

A Proposition, that this application be approved subject to conditions relating to occupancy as holiday accommodation, ecology, drainage and materials, was duly Seconded.

Approved, subject to conditions to be specified by the Case Officer in relation to occupancy as holiday accommodation, ecology, drainage and materials.

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

Note:

This decision was contrary to the Officer recommendation because a majority of the Committee concluded that the site was sustainable and the proposal would make a positive contribution to the rural economy.

CT.9171

Single-storey extension at 14 Hatherop, Cirencester -

The Case Officer reminded the Committee of the location of this site and outlined the proposals, drawing attention to the elevations. The Case Officer displayed photographs illustrating views of the existing building, the adjacent pair of semi-detached buildings and a Listed Building.

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 referred to the reason for the Sites Inspection Briefing, which was to assess the impact of the proposal on the neighbouring Listed Building, and commented that such Listed Building had benefited from the addition of a modest side extension in the past seven/eight years. The Ward Member contended that this current proposal had been designed to mirror the extension on the adjacent Listed Building in size and character, and would be constructed using comparable materials which would be sympathetic to the Conservation Area in which the site and the Listed Building were situated. The Ward Member expressed the view that this application would not have any adverse impact on the Listed Building as it would merely copy the extension to that building and that, when permission had been granted for that extension, it had undoubtedly been considered to not have any adverse impact on the building. The Ward Member considered it perverse to now take a contrary view in relation to an application on the neighbouring site, and he concluded by urging the Committee to approve this application.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that the extension was proposed for the principal elevation of the building and, as such, it was unlikely that it would be considered to be 'appropriate' on a Listed Building;

an extension to the side or rear of the building on this site was not possible, due to the constraints of the site; and no comments had been received from the Parish Council in respect of this application.

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

Refused, as recommended.

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

CT.0807/1/B

The installation of new AC condensers, refrigeration plant, louvre and satellite dish at Carted Barn, High Street, South Cerney -

The Case Officer drew attention to the extra representations received since the publication of the Schedule of Planning Applications, including an amended Officer recommendation to permit, and additional conditions in the event that the Committee was minded to approve this application.

The Case Officer reminded the Committee of the location of this site and outlined the proposals, drawing attention to the position of the equipment and the satellite dish; elevations; and screening. The Case Officer displayed an aerial photograph of the site, and photographs illustrating views of the rear elevation of the property.

The Ward Member, who served on the Committee, was invited to address the Committee and reminded the Meeting that permission for the store had been granted in 2014. The Ward Member referred to the proximity of the premises to a number of residential properties, and explained that the opening hours had been conditioned to match those of another shop premises in the vicinity of this site. The Ward Member requested the Committee to consider the well-being and living conditions of nearby residents in its determination of this current application. The Ward Member highlighted a number of concerns in respect of the amended Environmental Noise Impact Assessment (ENIA) report, and expressed the view that it would be more accurate to assess noise over fifteen minute periods rather than hourly periods, as suggested, given that the equipment would not run continuously for an hour at a time. The Ward Member commented on the calculation of noise emission limits, and pointed out that, on a logarithmic scale, an extra 3db amounted to a doubling of the actual noise levels and questioned if the increase in night time noise levels meant that the proposed attenuation measures would be noisier than the refrigeration plant. The Ward Member asked if the Committee was assured by the ability of the submitted ENIA report to protect the amenities of residents, and stated that she personally was not convinced. In that context, the Ward Member quoted from page 133 of the circulated report where it was stated that 'the proposed plant should just be capable of achieving the plant noise emission criteria' and from the conclusion on page 134 of that report. The Ward Member contended that noise emissions would increase as the machinery aged and, in conclusion, questioned how the Council could ensure, monitor and enforce noise levels in the future if it was accepted that brand new machinery 'should just be capable'.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that the proposed units would be situated one metre away from the nearest residences; the conditions referred to in the extra representations related to an approved scheme which had already been implemented; in the opinion of Officers, the Committee

had sufficient information to determine this application; the background noise level in the Council Chamber was 48db; and the developer could achieve a level of 24db at this site between 23.00 and 0.700 hours.

A Member suggested that, if the Committee was minded to approve this application, as recommended, an informative relating to tonal quality should be attached to any Decision Notice

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

The Ward Member was invited to address the Committee again, and expressed concern that noise emissions from this site were likely to have an adverse impact on the amenities of nearby residents.

Another Member expressed concern that the noise emissions from this site would have an adverse impact on the amenities of nearby residents, and Proposed that this application be refused. That Proposition was not Seconded.

Approved, as recommended, subject to an informative relating to tonal quality being attached to the Decision Notice.

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

CD.1034/X

Erection of a two-storey, two-bedroom attached dwelling at 7 New Road, Bledington -

The Case Officer reminded the Committee of the location of this site and outlined the proposals, drawing attention to the outdoor amenity space; parking; and elevations. The Case Officer displayed an aerial photograph of the site and photographs illustrating views into the site, the access and existing buildings.

The Applicant was invited to address the Committee.

The Ward Member, who was serving on the Committee at this Meeting as a Substitute Member, was invited to address the Committee. The Ward Member stated that Bledington was a vibrant community, and that the Parish Council was assiduous in carrying out its role within that community. The Ward Member referred to the strong objections submitted by the Parish Council and local residents to this application, and expressed concern that there was limited space for an independent dwelling on the proposed plot. The Ward Member contended that the front gable of the dwelling would be proud of the existing building line and that, as access to the rear garden of 7 New Road could only be achieved through the building, it was likely that refuse receptacles would be stored at the front of the property. The Ward Member explained that access to this group of houses was by way of a private, unadopted, narrow track which could only be accessed by one car at a time. The Ward Member further contended that an independent, freehold house would make only a minimum contribution to the housing stock in the village and he concurred with the views expressed by the village. In conclusion, the Ward Member suggested that this application should be refused.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that each application was determined on its merits; and, in the opinion of Officers, this proposal would not have any adverse impact on the area.

Some Members commented that this proposal constituted a modest dwelling which, in their opinion, accorded with policy, and they considered that this application should be approved as recommended. Other Members expressed concern over the storage of refuse receptacles and that this proposal constituted overdevelopment. Another Member considered that concerns over the storage of refuse receptacles could be mitigated, and commented that the Council should be encouraging developments of this size.

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

The Ward Member was invited to address the Committee again, and expressed concern that this proposal was likely to result in additional vehicles movements.

Approved, as recommended.

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

CD.2518/G

Proposed replacement outbuilding at Greenfields, Little Rissington -

The Case Officer reminded the Committee of the location of this site, and displayed a photograph illustrating the existing outbuilding.

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

Approved, as recommended.

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

06/00118/TPO

T32 Plane - prune back to the previous crown reduction pruning cuts and up to 500mm beyond if decay is found, into sound wood; pruning to prevent reoccurrence of subsidence at Abbey Grounds, Dugdale Road, Cirencester -

The Case Officer reminded the Committee of the location of this site and displayed a photograph of the subject tree.

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

Approved, as recommended.

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

06/00118/TPO

Fell and leave a 1.5m stump to regenerate or become deadwood habitat - T24 Purple Plum; tree has Ganoderma infection at Abbey Grounds, Dugdale Road, Cirencester -

The Case Officer reminded the Committee of the location of this site and displayed a photograph of the subject tree.

In response to a question from a Member, it was reported that the planting of a replacement tree would be constrained as this site was located in an area of Scheduled Ancient Monument.

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

Approved, as recommended.

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

Notes:

(i) Additional Representations

Lists setting out details of additional representations received since the Schedule of Planning Applications had been prepared were considered in conjunction with the related planning applications.

Further representations were reported at the Meeting in respect of applications CD.4714/N, CD.1236/1/F and CT.9171.

(ii) Public Speaking

Public speaking took place as follows:-

| | | |
|--------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| <u>CD.9552</u> |) | Mr. T Kernon (Agent) |
| <u>CD.9559</u> |) | Mr. H James (Agent) |
| <u>CD.4714/N</u> |) | Mr. R Ingles (Applicant) |
| <u>CD.1236/1/F</u> |) | Mrs. D Ludlow (Supporter) |
| |) | Ms C Quick (Applicant) * |
| |) | Mr. P Ecclestone |
| |) | (Applicants' Representative) * |
| <u>CD.1034/X</u> |) | Ms J Kennedy (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.101 SITES INSPECTION BRIEFINGS

1. Members for 1st February 2017

No applications were deferred for Sites Inspection Briefings.

2. Advance Sites Inspection Briefings

No advance Sites Inspection Briefings had been notified.

PL.102 OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business that was urgent.

The Meeting commenced at 9.30 a.m., adjourned between 10.50 a.m. and 11.00 a.m., and closed at 1.15 p.m.

Chairman

(END)