

CD. 9697/A - Applicant's Representation

**Subject:** 16/04953/FUL Doyles Cottage, Southrop

Mr Chairman, Committee, Good morning.

My name is Chris Moughton.

I own Doyles Cottage. I have lived there for 35 years. During that time I have tried to preserve the character of the house and grounds and have not, until very recently, sought to make any alterations or improvements to what is basically a simple unlisted 19th. century cottage.

Meanwhile, every other property around me has been either new build or extended, sometimes on a large scale. Similarly, adjacent farmland has been transformed into amenity land i.e. taken up as extra garden or extensively planted with trees, shrubs, hedges and fences. This has completely altered the appearance and character of the area. What was once open country is no longer. As part of an A.O.N.B. and affecting a Conservation Area I find that very disappointing and against the spirit of such designations. All of this has impacted greatly on me and the setting and outlook of Doyles Cottage.

Other major developments in the village have similarly changed the character of the village, not always for the better.

I have tolerated this and now, when I wish to make some simple improvements to my home to bring it up to 20th. century standards ( let alone 21st century ) I am met with heavy opposition which I consider inconsistent and inappropriate.

I just want more comfortable accommodation as I plan to retire - decent bathroom facilities and enough room so that I can invite guests to stay - most especially my daughter and grandchildren

On the more technical planning criteria I am pleased to see that both the Planning Officer and Conservation Officer recommend approval. I trust you will too.

11/04/2017

CD.9513/A - Objector's Representation

## **Comments on Planning Application 17/00168/FUL**

**Lane House, Sawpits Lane, Lower Oddington, GL56 0US**

**Extension and alteration to existing property**

**Objection – Timothy and Gabriella Tose – Old Bake House, Lower Oddington**

Following on from our other two objections and our comments made at the planning committee meeting dated 8<sup>th</sup> March 2017 we have the following further remarks to make in support our objection to the current proposals

### Impact on Conservation Area

The proposed extension and alteration works are within 50 m of two listed buildings, A fact that was ignored on the application form; and is one of the standard questions asked. The Planning Officer should have picked this up.

The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that

‘Special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area’

Similarly the Oddington Conservation Area Statement (June 2004) clearly states within the Design Guidance that

1. Any works carried out need to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the area
2. Extensions should reflect the pattern of building in Oddington, especially in scale and proportion
3. Materials should be in accordance with those traditionally used and should retain a similar mix

Within the comments that were made by the adjudicator in the last appeal, when permission was refused, he enforced this by saying the proposed works added no enhancement to the Conservation Area and therefore should not be permitted.

Our argument is not that there shouldn't be an extension; but more importantly that it should be built to enhance the Conservation Area. Given the choice of modern materials and the modern architectural design this is not sympathetic and will stand out and diminish the current values and traditional appeal of this picturesque village.

We have adhered strictly to the planning rules and recently brought a derelict Grade 2 listed house back into use by conforming to these rules; and we would like the same approach to be applied to the surrounding houses, so the village environment is maintained within the Conservation Area.

Although comments have been made that this proposed extension isn't that visible, which we disagree with, it would set a poor precedent for further applications to be made using this as the example within the Oddington village.

CT\_1645/G - Objector's Representation  
OBJECTION

APPLICATION NO. 16/04427/FUL - RESIDENTS' COMMENTS.

Dolphins Hall - Objection to CDC Planning Committee on 12<sup>th</sup> April 2017

Residents of Tetbury have been anticipating an excellent new build community hall for which there is already planning permission and there has been no public consultation on this alternative plan to extend an outdated 1950's building no longer fit for purpose. Substantial funds will be available from S106 developments etc. making the new build, with foresight and imagination, a feasible way forward and something for this fast growing town to be proud of.

The proposed extension is within AONB and will be less than 2 metres from the conservation area closely surrounded by Grade II and Grade II\* listed buildings. It will be fully visible from all of these properties, one of which has a legal right of way across the proposed site that has been ignored by the applicant.

We fully agree with Historic England who have objected on the grounds that this bulky overdevelopment of the site has not been properly assessed regarding its impact on its setting and more consideration should be given to alternative siting of any extension. They state that 'in line with the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 planning authorities should only treat proposals favourably when they preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to or better reveal the significance of the asset.' This extension will not.

The proposed extension primarily for the Youth Club will be bigger than the existing hall and is not internally connected to it prohibiting the extent of potential usefulness to the wider community. Further to the applicant's comments regarding remembering the youth of Tetbury, we would point out that when they moved they were offered excellent alternative facilities, but refused them.

The conservation officer pointed out that Section 7 of the NPPF requires good design (this is not), a strong sense of place responding to local character and history reflecting the identity of the surroundings and material (this does not). Policy 15 also states, permission should not be permitted if new or altered buildings are out of keeping with the special character or appearance of the location, (in siting, scale, form, proportions, design and materials), or there would be a loss of open spaces that make a valuable contribution. This proposed extension fails on all counts.

We already experience intolerable internal and external noise and anti-social behaviour from the existing hall and adding another entrance immediately adjacent, as well as creating an alley way approximately 25m x 2m between the extension on the south aspect and the wall to the graveyard and residential properties, can only exacerbate these problems for many homes in New Church Street.

We feel obliged to mention, that many people, have had a conflict of interests in the pursuit of this planning application. Two of the four people on Tetbury Town Council planning, who voted for this development, are also on the Dolphins Hall Committee. We therefore suggest that you have a moral as well as a planning obligation to refuse this ugly development.

# CD, 9616 - Parish Council Representation

The Planning Committee  
Cotswold District Council  
Trinity Road  
Cirencester  
Gloucestershire  
GL7 1PX

10/04/17

Dear Sir/Madam,

Re: 16/04529/FUL Conversion and extension of Dutch barn to form a single dwelling; conversion and alteration of barn 2 to form 3 dwellings to be used as holiday lets and extension, use of barn 1 for purposes falling within class B1 (business) and for stabling of horses and creation of new access at Barns to East of Grange Farm Horn Lane Evenlode Gloucestershire.

We have a number of issues with this application however our overriding concern relates to the accumulation of traffic created by this large and complex development.

We have read the applicants' Transport Assessment very carefully and find that it substantially underestimates traffic volumes.

All six of the comparator sites used in TRICS computer traffic model are mobile caravan parks. Therefore the model equates each Grange Farm letting unit with a single towed caravan. This is simply wrong. The 6 bedroom unit as proposed at Grange Farm will require more than 1 car to service it, likewise the 4 bedroom unit and so on. These distortions accumulate quickly.

The inclusion of a communal space in Barn 2 will encourage the combined letting of the whole complex to single large groups arriving separately in several cars and possibly at the same time.

The study also ignores movements resulting from cleaning staff, seminar events, and equestrian liveries. Traffic is worsened by the remote nature Grange Farm from shops, transport networks and attractions.

Unfortunately, the comments from GCC Highways do not address any of these inconsistencies and omissions. Instead GCC Highways has taken the applicants' Transport Assessment at face value and we now note that these same errors have fed through to the Planning Officer's report.

Furthermore, while they all deal exhaustively with the site entrance, they essentially ignore obvious problems within the overall setting ... the blind bends, the numerous pinch points and the dangerous junctions.

This Transport Assessment is not fit for purpose and must not be relied upon for decisions regarding public safety or the impact on the local Conservation Area.

We believe that the setting's vulnerability to increased traffic can only be properly understood by a site visit from the full planning committee covering not only the site entrance but the access routes through the village.

Yours faithfully,  
Evenlode Parish Council.

CD. 9616 - Applicant's Representation,  
CDC CLERK / COMMITTEE ADMINISTRATOR.

CD 9616

Grange Farm, Evenlode

The planning permission is being sought as part of a sustainable plan for Grange Farm for the next 20 - 30 years. A combination of live, work, agriculture and tourism, all four working in tandem. By seeking planning permission we want to be open about the scope of our plans, rather than incremental permitted development.

Any commercial plan for the farm has to balance funding the farm with the continued maintenance of the land for use by locals and visitors

We have agreed a further 2 year farm tenancy with our existing tenant. Another farmer is keen for a further 5 year tenancy beyond that.

As a very small farm, we are aware that the current farm income doesn't cover the costs of properly maintaining the farm and landscape so typical to the Cotswolds.

We are uncertain what will happen to the single farm payment in the future. We will have to diversify as neighbouring farmers have done.

#### Business

We run a small fabric and wallpaper company. We are one of the few hand print studios in the UK, continuing a tradition that the Arts & Crafts movement made famous in this part of the country. Over 13 years we have built a following for our contemporary designs in the UK and internationally.

We have close connections to the National Trust and are at present working with them on a two year project with an Arts & Crafts property in Sussex.

Currently the business employs:     3 full time staff.  
  2 part time staff.

We also have at least 10 major makers and suppliers to our business within a 15 mile radius of Evenlode with further suppliers nationally from weavers to glass blowers.

## Holiday Lets

For the holiday lets we plan to have a flexible layout that can accommodate a large family group or 2 -3 smaller groups and a large games room / amenity space for evenings and rainy days. There is only one other holiday let with in 20 miles that has a similar flexibility.

We shall also be targeting two further groups:

### Residential courses.

We currently run one day print workshops. We have an enormous demand for longer workshops in both screen printing and other crafts.

Currently, many participants stay the night before or after the course often making a weekend of it and bringing their spouse.

The flexible accommodation and amenity space together with our workshop would provide the perfect environment for these longer workshops.

### Cyclists:

Evenlode sits among some of the best cycling in the country. There are very few holiday lets locally that offer facilities specifically for the cyclist, with secure indoor bike storage, wash facilities and a small workshop for day to day maintenance. As a keen cyclist I have a good relationship with two good local bike workshops that offer excellent bike hire and support.

## In Conclusion

With the decline of traditional agricultural employment, we believe that this development plays an important part in helping the network of emerging small businesses that are providing an exciting and creative alternative to the Cotswolds traditional reliance on agriculture.

We hope you feel able to support this application.



# CT. 9209 - Parish Council Representation

Comments for Planning Application 16/05335/OUT to be read at the committee meeting of 12.04 17

**Application Summary Application Number: 16/05335/OUT Address: Land Northwest Of Manor Farm Driffield Gloucestershire Proposal: Outline application (with appearance, landscaping and layout reserved for further consideration) for the erection of an agricultural worker's dwelling Case Officer: Joe Seymour**

The Parish Council are in principle supportive of the application subject to the strict enforcement of an Agricultural Tie attached to any approval and also a Section 106 Agreement which should allocate a substantial sum of money to the Parish Council for the following :

1. Increased maintenance of already damaged verges to the access road which will be even *more exacerbated by increased traffic flows.*
2. More adequate signage
3. Upkeep and maintenance to the Driffield Church which (in the absence of) acts also as a Village hall/Meeting Place, where the social side to the village such as Christmas parties and theatrical events take place.

## CT. 9209 - Supporter's Representation

Speech by Tony Norris in Support of the Application – Land Northwest of Manor Farm, Driffield  
Reference 16/05335/OUT

I am the Farm Manager at RAU in Hamhill and I would like to support the application for Mr & Mrs Ford to live amongst their farm buildings.

Manor Farm had a farm house and buildings within the centre of the village, but as farming evolved these buildings were no longer fit for purpose and were sold off by the previous owners in the early 1970's. They were replaced by a modern set of buildings on the outskirts of the village; these buildings and surrounding farmland have changed ownership and changed over time to be a comprehensive modern farm yard. All Mr & Mrs Ford are looking to do is to seek permission to put a farm house back with these buildings.

As you are fully aware, Paragraph 55 of National Planning Policy Framework – States that we should “promote sustainable development in rural areas... Where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities....” Surely, this long established farming enterprise is doing just this.

It also states that you should “avoid new isolated homes in countryside” Definition of isolated in the Oxford English Dictionary is “separated from other persons or things; alone; solitary” – the proposed farm house is certainly not isolated when it will form part of the existing farmyard.

I understand that the National Planning Policy Framework does not itself contain any guidance on how to determine essential need for a rural worker to live/near the site. The CDC therefore produced an informal guidance, namely that such a dwelling would need to be justified as essential based on such matters as functional need and financial tests. There is no clear definition on functional needs, animal husbandry may be the most frequent reason, but agriculture is such a diverse industry that no set criteria will be relevant to all situations. There is a functional need for a farm house to be attached to the farmyard.

Security is an issue for all farmyards; they are often targeted with thefts being seen of agricultural vehicles of all sizes. Within the Parish of Driffield and Hamhill, we have an active “Neighbourhood watch” scheme, but we still have experienced at least two thefts from outbuildings of private residences and the theft of a JCB kept at a yard just off the road to Manor Farm Buildings. Also, the Countrywide store just outside the village that has been raided on numerous occasions. Being in such close proximity to the A419 which links both the M5 and M4 can be a reason why we have attracted such crime in our parish. If you grant permission for a farm house at this site, this would provide another deterrent for potential thieves to overcome.

I'm fully aware of the serious risks that farm workers undertake within the agricultural industry. It is of particular concern to The Health and Safety Executive where farmers work on their own. The HSE issue guidelines on lone workers, it states that we must put in place suitable steps to monitor lone workers by effective means of communication. HSE recommends periodically visiting the site, keeping in regular contact by phone, ensuring workers have left site and arrived home safely. By reattaching the farm house to the farm yard Mrs Ford can monitor the comings and goings more effectively.

# CT. 9209 - Applicant's Representations

Application 16/05335/OUT Land Northwest of Manor Farm Driffield 13/4/17

Gordon has lived in Driffield for 50 years and has been helping his dad on the farm since a very young age. We moved away from the family partnership four years ago and now farm in our own right.

We have four sons, two of whom are showing signs of following in the family footsteps. We want to be able to nurture this enthusiasm for they will be the future of our business.

We want them to have that valuable experience in farming, by being within the heart of the business. To gain that essential hands on experience, it is not just about watching dad on a tractor in a field, it's about seeing how all the jobs fit together and our children being able to help whenever they can.

The boys look to spend time with their father, he, like most other farmers work very long hours, he leaves the house around 7 each morning and returns some 12 hours to 16 hours later, at the peaks. Family life is being affected because of the distance, between our home and the main farm unit. If we were living at the main farm unit, where Gordon has his workshop and where most of the operations span from, the boys will have more opportunity to see and spend time with him.

But it is not just about being close for family reasons; it's about security and safety.

Rural crime in Gloucestershire increased by 36% between 2015 and 2016. We have a number of very expensive farm machines kept at this site together with a very well equipped workshop, stocks of fertiliser and chemicals; security is of great concern to us. We have taken some steps to deter theft from our premises, but we feel that living at the site would be one more deterrent. We have insurance in place, but surely we need to take sufficient steps prevent the crime from happening in the first place.

Agriculture as you know is one the most hazardous industries to work in. We take safety very seriously, especially as Gordon works most of the time alone. Living at Manor Farm Buildings would not prevent an accident, but if the unfortunate event should occur I could be on site to administer first aid and call the emergency services far quicker, every second counts.

When submitting our application reference was made to Policy DS3 of the Emerging Local Plan, here it states that "Outside the Development Boundaries of Principle Settlements, that small-scale residential development will be permitted".

We don't want to build a small settlement just one house in amongst Farm buildings.

The application was not originally submitted under "an essential need for a rural worker". However, the planning officer has assessed our application on this basis, we are happy to accept an agricultural tie if the committee deem it appropriate, as this will not affect us as it will be used as a genuine farmhouse. However, it would appear that the planning officer's recommendation is that there is no functional need for somebody to be based there. We argue this case strongly.

As it clearly states in the Agricultural report, in an ideal world Manor Farm would have a farmhouse close to the farm buildings. We are not property developers; we just want to be able to live amongst our farm buildings. I ask you to make our ideal world a reality.

Karen Ford – The Applicant

## CD, 6115/K - Objector's Representations

Mr. Chairman and District Councillors, thank you for permitting me to speak today and for previously voting in favour of an SIB before reaching a decision on this application.

My name is Jocelyn Rathbone, owner of The Stable, the property most directly affected by the proposed extension at Willow House.

As mentioned before, I don't object to the applicant replacing her conservatory per se, and can understand her reason – BUT would like any extension to be in proportion and respectful of the impact on my own property.

The Parish Council have expressed concern about the height of the extension, that it appears to over-dominate my property, and consider it intrusive in nature given the very close proximity of the two dwellings.

The planning history of this property shows that many applications have been made over the last 35 years, with nearly half being refused. However, a number of additions have been made to Willow House with a cumulative and irreversible result, as shown in a photograph recently submitted to CDC. In my view, an extension of the size and scale proposed is over-bearing and excessive in-light of what has been allowed before.

The revised drawings (submitted 3 and a half months after the initial application) offer a greater degree of detail but I still have concerns about the substantial scale of the proposed extension. Also, given that Willow House and my property are at 90 degrees to one another, this side extension to Willow House has the effect on The Stable of being a front extension.

The proportions of the proposed extension are significantly out of scale.

The plans show that at 7.3 or 7.6 metres, **the length would be double** that of the existing glazed structure, and would in all probability reduce light/daylight and increase shade especially in the winter. In addition, although the drawing of the front elevation is incomplete, it's clear the length of the extension would be *greater* than the length of the original building's front elevation – and yet it is a general design principle that any addition should be subservient to the host building.

At 6.4 metres the initial width of the proposed extension is also considerable - only 3% less than the length of the front elevation of the host dwelling with a minimal set back of 0.15 metres behind the front elevation – much less than many local authorities design guide's state is desirable or permissible.

The overall roof area and the floor area will both be **double the size of the existing conservatory**, along with a substantial increase of at least 25% in ridge height.

Local Plan Policy 42 Cotswold Design Code cites proportionality as being important and that 'All extensions should be in scale and character with the building to which they are added.' The overall size and scale of the proposed extension goes **against** Policy 42 which *also* states that '**Excessive bulk should be avoided**'. Furthermore, extensions should not detract from the established amenities of adjoining residents.

#### **TO CONCLUDE**

I truly value this area and feel that new developments should respect the existing heritage. I believe the proposed extension is excessive in bulk and out of scale with the host building, and will result in an overbearing and unneighbourly form of development detrimental to the established amenities of a nearby resident.

Willow House is already a heavily extended property. I consider this application to be a further and substantial extension which will have an irreversible and adverse effect on my own property. I therefore respectfully ask the Members of the Committee **not** to approve this application in its current form.

# 05.6115/K - Applicant's Representations

Committee Meeting 12th April 2017

Planning Ref 16/05271/FUL

Comments from Applicant, Ms Theresa Herbert-Davis

Now that some of you have had an opportunity to visit the site, and see the dimensions and location of this proposed extension, I hope that you will agree with the Planning Officers recommendation for approval on the following grounds.

1) The proposed extension meets all planning regulations regarding size scale materials and design and does not breach the 45' rule.

2) It does **not** take light, privacy nor overlook the one very part time neighbour who has objected, nor does its single storey height over dominate, since the proposed structure is only 0.6 metres higher than the existing and its ridge is 2.5 metres further away. Moreover, the bulk of the proposed building is itself 2metres **further** from the boundary

3) Willow House was built in the 1800s to house the single men working on Lyncroft Farm. Its identical 'sister' house Lyncot, which housed the married couples, is situated diagonally behind my property and in front of The Stable. This has, by precedent, been extended many times, to the rear and both sides over the years, and is substantially larger today than Willow House.

4) Five direct neighbours have issued letters of support for this application. The parish council clerk issued a **comment**, not an objection as was stated. This comment contains the same factual inaccuracies found in the objectors original letter.

5) This area of Bourton, as you have seen, contains houses of all designs and sizes. A converted stable is by its nature small and surrounding properties are not responsible for that. Much has been written about **close proximity** and the historic rear extension at Willow House but The Stable has a historic garage extension right up to my rear boundary, which has been converted to the much referred to main living room of The Stable today. It is perhaps **this close proximity** that gives the objector his **subjective** notion of being overdominated and dwarfed, rather than actual planning facts and figures.

Subjective feeling coupled with vocal objection should not be permitted to create red herrings and smokescreens to the facts, when planning proposals do meet the necessary guidelines.