

COTSWOLD DISTRICT COUNCIL

PLANNING AND LICENSING COMMITTEE

10TH MAY 2017

Present:

Councillor Tina Stevenson - Vice-Chairman (In the Chair)

Councillors -

AW Berry
AR Brassington
Sue Coakley
Alison Coggins
PCB Coleman
RW Dutton
Jenny Forde

David Fowles
M Harris
RL Hughes
Mrs. SL Jepson (until 1.10 p.m.)
Juliet Layton
MGE MacKenzie-Charrington

Observers:

Julian Beale (until 10.30 a.m.)
Maggie Heaven (from 1.15 p.m.)

R Theodoulou (from 10.30 a.m. until
1.10 p.m.)

Apologies:

SG Hirst

PL.137 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

(1) Member Declarations

Councillor AW Berry declared an interest in respect of application CT.5542/B, because he was acquainted with the Applicants.

Councillor Sue Coakley declared an interest in respect of application CT.5542/B, because she was acquainted with the Applicants.

Councillor Alison Coggins declared an interest in respect of application CT.5542/B, because she had campaigned on behalf of the Applicants' Son at a recent by-election.

Councillor Jenny Forde declared an interest in respect of application CT.5542/B, because she was acquainted with the Agent in a professional capacity.

Councillor David Fowles declared a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in respect of application CD.2682/1/V, because he was employed by the Applicant, and he left the Meeting while that item was being determined.

Councillor David Fowles declared an interest in respect of application CT.5542/B, because he was acquainted with the Applicants.

Councillor Mrs. SL Jepson declared a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in respect of application CD.2682/1/V, because she was a former employee of the Applicant, and she left the Meeting while that item was being determined.

Councillor Mrs. SL Jepson declared an interest in respect of application CT.5542/B, because she was acquainted with the Applicants.

Councillor Lynden Stowe had declared a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in respect of application CD.2682/1/V, because he was the Applicant. Councillor Stowe was not present at this Meeting.

(2) Officer Declarations

The Principal Solicitor declared an interest in respect of application CT.5542/B, because she was acquainted with the Applicants, and she left the Meeting while that item was being determined.

PL.138 SUBSTITUTION ARRANGEMENTS

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

PL.139 MINUTES

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the Meeting of the Committee held on 12th April 2017 be approved as a correct record.

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

PL.140 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were no announcements from the Chairman.

PL.141 PUBLIC QUESTIONS

No public questions had been submitted.

PL.142 MEMBER QUESTIONS

No questions had been received from Members.

PL.143 PETITIONS

No petitions had been received.

PL.144 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.9631

Outline application for development of up to 14 dwellings, public open space, landscaping and other associated works at land at Plum Orchard, Moreton Road, Longborough -

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 Members to read those representations that 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 proximity to the Conservation Area, other residential properties and an industrial unit; other land in the vicinity which was owned by the Applicant; and an indicative layout. The Case Officer displayed photographs illustrating views of the site from various vantage points, and views from within the site.

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

The Chairman referred to the advance Sites Inspection Briefing undertaken in respect of this application, and invited those Members who had attended that Briefing to express their views. The Members considered this to be an ideal site for the proposed development but expressed concern over issues relating to the height of some of the units in relation to land levels through the site.

The Ward Member, who did not serve on the Committee, was invited to address the Committee and stated that need and desirability were the main issues in relation to this development. The Ward Member referred to drainage and odour issues in relation to an adjacent development and suggested that, if the Committee was minded to approve this application as recommended, attempts should be made to rectify those problems, if that was feasible.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that it would not be feasible to rectify the on-going problems relating to the adjacent development through this application; the land owner was aware of the problems relating to the adjacent development and a different connection point to the sewer had been

suggested in respect of this application; if the Committee was minded to approve this application as recommended, a condition that none of the properties could be occupied until a sewage system had been agreed with Thames Water could be attached to any Decision Notice; the existing hedge would be protected as it was not proposed that it would form part of the gardens of the properties within this development; in its role as Lead Local Flood Authority, Gloucestershire County Council had not raised any objections in respect of surface water drainage, due to the mitigation and attenuation measures which had been suggested; the issue of scale was a 'reserved matter' but the Committee should iterate any concerns over issues, including the height of the proposed units, so that they could be addressed at the appropriate time; the sewage and odour issues associated with the adjacent development had arisen since completion of that development in 2012; odour was an environmental health issue, and the Case Officer undertook to check with Officers in Environmental and Regulatory Services to ascertain if any reports of problems had been received; the Emerging Local Plan supported small-scale developments in villages; there were some local employment opportunities in the vicinity of this site; Longborough had not met the criteria for inclusion as a 'sustainable' village in the Emerging Local Plan; the issue of profit was not a material consideration in the determination of planning applications; the land rose by 8 metres across the site from east to west; and, as the Parish Council and Officers had expressed differing opinions in relation to the mix of house types and housing need, the Committee would need to address that issue that day if it was minded to approve this application as recommended.

It was considered that, if the Committee was minded to approve this application as recommended, issues relating to the height of the proposed units and protection of the existing hedge should be addressed, and that the reserved matters application should be referred to the Committee for determination.

A Proposition, that that this application be approved as recommended subject to discussions between Officers and the Parish Council in respect of the housing mix and between Thames Water and Bromford Housing Association in respect of sewage issues, was not Seconded.

A Member expressed the view that the Committee should address the issue of the housing mix, if it was minded to approve this application as recommended. The Member suggested that it was likely that three-bedroom units would be occupied by people from outside the village. The Member considered that the housing mix which had been suggested by Officers would help to ensure that the development was available to 'local' people, and would therefore meet the expectations of the Parish Council and local community.

A Proposition, that this application be approved as recommended, including the mix of housing suggested by Officers, was duly Seconded.

Another Member considered that, if the Committee was minded to approve this application, the housing mix should be as suggested by the Parish Council. However, a further Proposition to that effect was not Seconded.

The Ward Member was invited to address the Committee again, and stated that Environmental and Regulatory Services had been consulted over the issue of odour but had been unable to take action.

Approved, subject to the housing mix being as suggested by Officers and to the prior completion of a Section 106 Agreement relating to financial

contributions in respect of education, the provision of affordable housing and public open spaces.

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

CD.1647/Y

Demolition and removal of existing buildings, and the erection of a Class A1 foodstore (1,918 sqm gross floor area) with associated access, car parking and landscaping at land at Fosseyway Farm, Stow Road, Moreton-in-Marsh -

The Case Officer drew attention to the extra representations received since publication of the Schedule of Planning Applications. The Case Officer reminded the Committee of the location of this site and outlined the proposals, drawing attention to its proximity to existing residential development; access; materials; height; an extant permission; and elevations. The Case Officer displayed photographs illustrating views of the site from various vantage points.

A Member of the Town Council, a Supporter and the Agent were invited to address the Committee.

The Ward Member, who served on the Committee, was invited to address the Committee and explained that the principle of development on this site had been established in 2015. The Ward Member amplified her reasons for referring this application to the Committee for determination, and expressed her view that this current application would not result in as good a development as proposed under the extant permission, and she reminded the Committee that this site was located in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the Conservation Area. The Ward Member explained that, under this current application, approximately 40% of the site was proposed for development, but that the soft landscaping on the western boundary which had been proposed under the extant permission, had not been included as part of this current application due to the location of the proposed building within the site. The Ward Member noted that, under this current application, the height of the proposed building and the floor space, had been reduced in comparison to the extant permission, and expressed her view that the building proposed under the extant permission had fitted well in the site. The Ward Member contended that the current building would not sit comfortably in this site as, in her opinion, it had an industrial aesthetic which she did not consider to be 'appropriate' at the entrance to a Cotswold market town. The Ward Member reminded the Committee that the adjacent hospital and doctors' surgery had been allowed as 'exceptions', and expressed the view that they had fitted into the surrounding area. The Ward Member further contended that the extant permission had proposed a 'restrained' development which would, in her opinion, be 'site appropriate'. The Ward Member considered that the current proposal was for a 'front-loaded' site and concluded by stating that she welcomed the subsequent debate in a public forum.

In response to various questions, it was reported that the current bus stop would be relocated on the A429, as proposed under the extant permission; the floor of the delivery bay would be set into the ground to avoid the need to use mechanical lifts on delivery lorries; the delivery times proposed in condition 17 had been specified by the Environmental Health Officer; the submitted lighting scheme had been assessed by the Environmental Health Officer; if the Committee was minded to approve this application as recommended, the wording of the suggested condition relating to lighting could be amended to include reference to 'light spread', if it was appropriate to do so; landscaping in the form of a native species

hedge was proposed along the western boundary of this site; the likely occupier of the proposed store was not a relevant consideration for the Committee; the adjacent land was currently in the same ownership as this site; and, if the Committee was minded to approve this application as recommended, suggested conditions 13-15 could be deleted as in its role as Lead Local Flood Authority, Gloucestershire County Council had not raised any objections in respect of run-off.

Some Members concurred with the comments made on behalf of the Town Council and by the Ward Member. Concern was expressed that the proposed access was flawed and would have a major adverse impact on the A429. It was also considered that the road which had been constructed between this site and the hospital would increase the pressure on the A429 at some time in the future and that congestion in the town centre could be exacerbated if lorries visiting this site travelled along the High Street.

Other Members expressed support for the proposed development. A Proposition, that this application be approved as recommended subject to the deletion of conditions 13-15 and the amendment of the lighting condition to include reference to 'light spread' and the requirement to submit further details.

The Ward Member was invited to address the Committee again and referred to the suggestion by the developer that people could park at this site while they visited the town centre. It was reported that, in its assessment of this application, the Committee should consider if a refusal could be justified if such an offer had not been made.

Approved, as recommended, the Case Officer being authorised to amend the suggested conditions as discussed.

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

CD.2682/1/V

Change of Use from Pump House (Sui Generis) to Sandwich Bar (A10 at redundant Pump House adjacent to 1 Willersey Industrial Estate, Willersey -

The Case Officer drew attention to the photographs attached to the circulated report.

There were no questions from Members.

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

Approved, as recommended.

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

CD.2682/1/V**Change of Use from agricultural land to burial ground/churchyard including new enclosures and repair of existing dry stone wall at All Saints Church, Church Road, Down Ampney -**

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 Church, the curtilage of the Church and a pedestrian access. The Case Officer displayed an aerial photograph of the site and photographs illustrating views into and through the site.

A Member of the Parish Council and a representative of the Applicant were invited to address the Committee.

The Ward Member, who served on the Committee, was invited to address the Committee and amplified the reasons why he had referred this application to the Committee for determination. The Ward Member stated that burials took place in Fairford Cemetery in close proximity to the River Churn and that graves were often waterlogged. The Ward Member reminded the Committee that Down Ampney had been identified as a 'sustainable settlement' in the Emerging Local Plan, and he referred to a proposal for 44 new dwellings in the village which had recently been approved. The Ward Member contended that it was wrong that residents would not be able to be buried in the village Churchyard. He considered Down Ampney to be a successful community with a number of facilities, and he referred to the community's efforts to raise funds to purchase this land, adding that there was an expectation that planning permission for a Change of Use would be forthcoming. The Ward Member further contended that there were approximately 4 burials in the village each year, and pointed out that there had not been any evidence of contamination of the water supply over the past 700 years that burials had taken place in the current cemetery. The Ward Member considered there to be a very low risk, and reminded the Committee that this site was situated on higher ground and located further away from the stream than the current cemetery. The Ward Member concluded by expressing the hope that common sense would prevail and that the Committee would agree that the benefits of this proposal outweighed any harm.

In response to various questions, it was reported that, in assessing this proposal, Officers had been bound by the advice from the Environment Agency; while the Council always had a duty of care, the Committee could reach a different conclusion to that reached by Officers having taken account of the advice from the Environment Agency; Officers had discussed some other options with the Applicant, including the raising of ground levels and burials in a mausoleum, but the Applicant had considered those other options to be too expensive and impractical; while a condition requiring plots to be for single burials could be attached to any Decision Notice if the Committee was minded to approve this application, the Council would have to justify such a condition in the event of a challenge; in the opinion of Officers, the land was not suitable for use as a cemetery; as it was currently agricultural land, and the application had been assessed as one for a new cemetery.

Some Members considered there to be an unacceptable risk to the water table at this site from double burials, and a slight risk of challenge to any condition seeking to prohibit double burials. Other Members contended that, while the Environment Agency had a statutory duty to raise objections, this site was further away from the stream and the original cemetery had existed for hundreds of years without any evidence of contamination. One Member stated that space was a major consideration and that, if the Committee was minded to approve this application, the space would be used up quickly if double burials were prohibited.

The Ward Member was invited to address the Committee again, and stated that the Officer recommendation reflected the requirements of the Environment Agency. The Ward Member contended that there were powerful arguments to approve this application and, in conclusion, reiterated that there was a need for additional space as the current cemetery was nearly at capacity.

A Proposition, that this application be approved subject to a condition prohibiting double burials 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 7, abstentions 0, Ward Member unable to vote 1, absent 1.

A further Proposition, that this application be approved subject to conditions to be specified by the Case Officer to include landscaping and boundary treatment, was duly Seconded.

Approved, subject to conditions to be specified by the Case Officer in consultation with the Ward Member.

Record of Voting - for 11, against 2, abstentions 0, Ward Member unable to vote 1, absent 1.

Note:

This decision was contrary to the Officer recommendation because, having assessed all of the issues, including the Environment Agency advice, a majority of Members had concluded that the harm which could arise from this proposal was outweighed by the public benefits that would accrue.

CD.3972/H

Proposed replacement 4-bedroom dwelling and outbuilding at Studio Barn, Hidcote Boyce, Ebrington -

The Case Officer drew attention to the extra representations received since publication of the Schedule of Planning Applications. The Case Officer reminded the Committee of the location of this site and outlined the proposals, drawing attention to the current and proposed curtilages. The Case Officer displayed an aerial photograph of the site and photographs illustrating views of the existing building and from various public vantage points, a virtual Google Street view of the area and images of the proposed development which had been supplied by the Applicant.

A Member of the Parish Council and the Applicant were invited to address the Committee.

The Ward Member, who served on the Committee, was invited to address the Committee and reminded the Committee that this site was situated in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which the Council was required to conserve and protect. The Ward Member contended that the application was contrary to Policy 22 and questioned whether the design, which she had found to be exciting and imaginative, was correct for what she considered to be a very special part of the Cotswolds. The Ward Member contended that Members would not be able to appreciate this special area if they had not visited Hidcote Boyce, and she reiterated that the Council had a duty to protect the special nature of the area. The Ward Member further contended that this application could be refused because, in her opinion, it was contrary to policy, and concluded by suggesting that it might be appropriate for consideration of this application to be deferred for a Sites Inspection Briefing.

In response to questions from Members, it was reported that, in its determination of this application, the Committee should consider if the proposal represented a quality design which would be appropriate in this location; the intention was not to screen the proposed building; and it was not considered that this proposal would have any adverse impact on Hidcote House.

A Proposition, that consideration of this application be deferred for a Sites Inspection Briefing which all Members of the Committee should be invited to attend, was duly Seconded.

The Ward Member was invited to address the Committee again and suggested that, if the Committee decided to undertake a Sites Inspection Briefing as proposed, Members should look at the surrounding area as well as the site in question.

(a) Deferred for a Sites Inspection Briefing to assess the existing building, the impact of the proposed development on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the implications of Policy 22.

(b) all Members of the Committee be invited to attend this Sites Inspection Briefing as an approved duty.

Record of Voting - for 8, against 1, abstentions 3, Ward Member unable to vote 1, did not vote 1, absent 1.

Note:

It was considered appropriate for all Members of the Committee to be invited to attend this Sites Inspection Briefing in order to consider the implications of the proposed development in relation to Policy 22.

CT.5542/B

Conversion of and extension of existing building and part Change of Use from agricultural to domestic at Coneygar Farm, Coneygar Road, Quenington -

The Case Officer reminded the Committee of the location of this site and outlined the proposals, drawing attention to existing and proposed elevations and floor plans. The Case Officer displayed photographs illustrating views of the existing building and an adjacent building.

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 explained that this building was located in a walled garden with access along an unmade track. The Ward Member stated that none of the farm buildings were listed, and he expressed his view that conversion as proposed would preserve this building, which he considered to be in a poor condition, for future generations. The Ward Member contended that the principle of conversion had been accepted and that Government policy encouraged barn conversions, and elderly people to remain in their homes. The Ward Member further stated that the perception was that the proposal would have an adverse impact on a non-designated heritage asset but he considered that the benefits of the proposed conversion would outweigh any adverse impact. The Ward Member further contended that any reduction in the width of the proposed extension would make it too small for its intended use. The Ward Member explained that the Applicants had worked with Officers over the proposed design and expressed the view that the building needed to be preserved and occupied in order to prevent its further deterioration. In conclusion, the Ward Member suggested that a Sites Inspection Briefing might be appropriate on this occasion.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that the issue was the size of the proposed extension, rather than the principle of development on this site; if the Committee was minded to approve this application, a condition restricting occupancy solely to the Applicants, members of their family or someone in their employment could be attached to any Decision Notice; having had regard to the relevant tests and policies, the Committee could reach a different conclusion to that reached by Officers; the barn was considered to be a 'traditional' farm building and a non-designated heritage asset and, in the opinion of Officers, the proposed extension did not accord with policy as it would not preserve the traditional form of the building; the cluster of buildings were inward facing the farm yard and Officers opposed the introduction of any openings in the southern elevation; the proposed extension was 7.6 metres x 4.6 metres; while deletion of the first floor windows would constitute an improvement in the overall design, Officers considered the ground floor extension to be harmful; each application should be considered on its merits; it was appropriate to consider alternative uses for such buildings which were not currently in their original use; and in its determination of this application, the Committee should consider if this proposal was harmful and, if so, whether the benefits that could accrue outweighed such harm.

Some Members considered that this proposal offered a practical solution as the farm would remain and that, on this occasion, the benefits outweighed any harm.

A Proposition, that this application be approved subject to conditions to be specified by the Case Officer, was duly Seconded.

Approved, subject to conditions to be specified by the Case Officer, to include an occupancy condition.

Record of Voting - for 10, against 4, abstentions 0, absent 1.

Note:

This decision was contrary to the Officer recommendation because a majority of the Committee considered that the contemporary approach to be acceptable and that it would not be harmful given the design and setting, and that the benefits which would accrue from this development would outweigh any harm.

CT.9112/F**Erection of single-storey extension to rear and internal alterations (amendment to 15/04263/LBC) at 54 Gloucester Street, Cirencester -**

The Case Officer drew attention to the extra representations received since publication of the Schedule of Planning Applications. The Case Officer reminded the Committee of the location of this site and outlined the proposals, drawing attention to the floor plan of the building and its elevations. The Case Officer displayed an aerial photograph of the site and photographs illustrating views of the building.

The Agent was invited to address the Committee, and explained that his comments also related to the subsequent application (CT.9112/E referred).

The Ward Member, who served on the Committee, was invited to address the Committee, and he amplified the reasons why he had referred this application, and the subsequent application, to the Committee for determination. The Ward Member contended that interest in buildings built up over time and that, on this occasion, the issue of uniformity related solely to the chimneys on the three buildings comprising this terrace.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that the terrace had been designed by an architect of local importance, who had designed a number of other buildings in the town; on balance, Officers considered this proposal to be harmful because it would result in the loss of a number of original features which had been assessed as being of importance; the addition of an extension, as proposed, would mask the original architectural intentions and, as this was a Listed Building, great weight should be attached to its conservation; if the Committee was minded to approve this application, the Applicant would rescind the extant permission which had proposed a 'lightweight' infill to provide additional space while retaining original features; listing related to the entire building; and, in this instance, the terrace had been listed because of its group value.

Some Members expressed the view that the extant permission would enable improvements to be made to the living facilities without having any adverse impact on the original features of the building and that approval of this current application would cause an unacceptable degree of harm.

The Ward Member was invited to address the Committee again and stated that, while changes could be made to Listed Buildings, any benefits accruing should be balanced against the harm caused. The Ward Member commented that the Council had permitted the demolition of a number of other buildings in the town which had been designed by the same architect and concluded by expressing his opinion that, on this occasion, the harm would not be outweighed by the benefits of development.

A Proposition, that this application be refused as recommended, was duly Seconded. On being put to the vote, that Proposition was LOST. The Record of Voting in respect of that Proposition was - for 3, against 7, abstentions 2, Ward Member unable to vote 1, absent 2.

A further Proposition, that this application be approved subject to conditions to be specified by the Case Officer, was duly Seconded.

Approved, subject to conditions to be specified by the Case Officer.

Record of Voting - for 7, against 3, abstentions 2, Ward Member unable to vote 1, absent 2.

Note:

This decision was contrary to the Officer recommendation because, whilst acknowledging the Listed status of the building and its situation in the Conservation Area, a majority of the Committee considered that the proposed changes would not be detrimental and that the benefit accruing outweighed any harm.

PL.145 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 13, against 0, abstentions 0, absent 2.

PL.146 SCHEDULE OF APPLICATIONS (CONTINUED)

RESOLVED that the remaining applications be dealt with in accordance with Minute PL.144 above:-

CT.9112/E

Erection of single-storey rear extension (amendment to 15/04262/FUL) at 54 Gloucester Street, Cirencester -

The Case Officer drew attention to the extra representations received since publication of the Schedule of Planning Applications.

The Agent had made all of his representations in respect of the previous application (CT.9112/F above referred).

The Ward Member stated that he had nothing to add to his comments made in respect of the previous application (CT.9112/F above referred).

A Proposition, that this application be approved subject to conditions to be specified by the Case Officer, was duly Seconded.

Approved, subject to conditions to be specified by the Case Officer.

Record of Voting - for 7, against 4, abstentions 1, Ward Member unable to vote 1, absent 2.

Note:

This decision was contrary to the Officer recommendation because, whilst acknowledging the Listed status of the building and its situation in the

Conservation Area, a majority of the Committee considered that the proposed changes would not be detrimental and that the benefit accruing outweighed any harm.

CT.0807/1/D

1 x externally illuminated projector, 1 x externally illuminated logo, 4 x non-illuminated wall mounted aluminium panels, 1 x non-illuminated acrylic letters at Co-Operative (Carted Barn), High Street, South Cerney -

The Case Officer reminded the Committee of the location of this site and outlined the proposals, drawing attention to its location adjacent to the Conservation Area.

The Ward Member, who served on the Committee, was invited to address the Committee and referred to the objections submitted by the Parish Council. The Ward Member contended that this application should be refused because, in her view, it was contrary to Policy 15 because of its proximity to the Conservation Area. In conclusion, the Ward Member stated that there were no other shops on this road and, therefore, she did not understand the need for spotlights in this location.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that the proposed signs would be illuminated by trough lights; in the opinion of Officers, the signs would not have any detrimental impact on the adjacent Conservation Area; and it was reasonable to have externally-illuminated signs on such a building.

A Member commented that this was a medium-sized shop, which was isolated from other commercial properties; the proposed lights would not have any significant impact on the Conservation Area; and the shop would provide some 'local' employment opportunities.

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

Approved, as recommended.

Record of Voting - for 11, against 0, abstentions 1, Ward Member unable to vote 1, absent 2

Notes:

(i) Additional Representations

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

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

Councillor Julian Beale was invited to speak on application CD.9631.

Councillor R Theodoulou was invited to speak on application CT.5542/B.

(iii) Public Speaking

Public speaking took place as follows:-

<u>CD.9631</u>)	Councillor T Gardner (Parish Council)
)	Mrs. M Wreay (Objector)
)	Mrs. J Hitchman (Supporter)
)	Mr. G Wakefield (Agent)
<u>CD.1647/Y</u>)	Councillor MW Lucas (Town Council)
)	Mr. Wainwright (Supporter)
)	Mr. D Williams (Agent)
<u>CD.2682/1/V</u>)	Councillor A Matthews (Parish Council)
)	Mr. D Skinner
)	(representing the Applicant)
<u>CD.3972/H</u>)	Councillor ADM Boyse (Parish Council)
)	Mr. A Wheel (Applicant)
<u>CT.5542/B</u>)	Mrs. J Morris (Applicant)
<u>CT.9112/F</u>)	Mr. G Hughes (Agent)
<u>CT.9112/E</u>)	Mr. G Hughes (Agent)

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.147 SITES INSPECTION BRIEFINGS

1. Members for 7th June 2017

All Members of the Committee were invited to attend the Sites Inspection Briefing on Wednesday 7th June 2017 as an approved duty.

Note:

It was suggested that, on this occasion, Members be requested to meet on site at 10.00 a.m.

2. Advance Sites Inspection Briefings

No advance Sites Inspection Briefings had been notified.

PL.148 OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business that was urgent.

The Meeting commenced at 9.30 a.m., adjourned between 11.10 a.m. and 11.20 a.m. and again between 1.10 p.m. and 1.25 p.m., and closed at 2.17 p.m.

Chairman

(END)