

CD.9631 - Parish Council Representation

Planning Application 17/00321/OUT - land at Plum Orchard, Longborough

Longborough Parish Council

A Housing Needs Survey by GRCC in autumn 2014 showed a need for 14 new homes, 5 of them affordable and as a result the owner of the land the subject of the application was approached. The Parish Council was then fully supportive of this.

Planning consultants, Hunter Page, held a Village Consultation Event on 22 November 2016 and subsequently a Village Open Meeting was held on 11 January 2017, slightly before the application was submitted. Both of these revealed views for and against the scheme.

The Parish Council held a special meeting on 20 February 2017 to consider the matter and, subject to there being satisfactory arrangements for the treatment of sewerage, **supported** this application for the following reasons:

- The identified need for more affordable housing;
- New permanent residential dwellers would create sustainability and add vibrancy to a working village;
- Promotion of the viability of key village amenities including primary school, shop, public house and church community ;
- Creation of additional play space for young people/families.

The Parish Council has seven members, one of whom was abroad at the time and thus could not vote. Five members voted in favour and one against. Membership of the Council changed between autumn 2014 and February 2017.

The Planning Officer's report recommends a condition requiring agreement of a satisfactory sewage system before any external walls are erected; this will meet a village need.

The Parish Council supported this application, which is recommended by the Planning Officer for approval.

CD. 9631 - Objector's Representation

Speech for Wed 10th May

Mr I and Mrs M Wreay
Washpool Cottage
Longborough
Moreton-in-Marsh
Glos GL560QN

Kevin Field
Planning and Development Officer
Cotswold District Council
Trinity Road
Cirencester Glos GL7 1PX

10th May 2017

Ref 17/00321/OUT

Outline Application for Development of up to 14 dwellings, public open space, landscaping and other associated works|Out line application|at Land AT plum Orchard Moreton Road|Charlesway South| Longborough Glos. For Mr M Stokes.

Good Morning Chair and Committee.

My husband and I continue to Object to the Outline Plans.

The proposed Sewerage Tank and Pump is depicted beside the access road at a higher elevation than half the dwellings. This is unfeasible.

You are already aware of the ongoing foul odour issues relating to the adjacent Plumtree Close development.

On the 26th April 2017, Mr P Nevin, Vice Chair of the Parish Council who resides at number 2 Plumtree Close, adjacent to the Bromford Tank and Pump informed us of the following related issue:

Mr S. Young, Asset Compliance Team, Bromford and the specialist expert visited the Tank and Pump and spoke with Mr Nevin.

The cost of the agreed Treatment Unit was suggested, however they did not know how deep the Tank was!
Mr Nevin suggested they put a line down the shaft.

It was also stated that the landowner, Mr Stokes wanted a larger capacity Tank and a more powerful Pump to accommodate a further building development of 14 properties on the adjoining land.

We therefore make a request to the Committee to ask for a response from the Developers and Mr Stokes if this is the case.

On the 2nd May we wrote a letter to the Managing Director of Bromford to confirm this. The Company has not responded.

The Foul Odour Issues in the adjoining Plumtree Close are still unresolved after 20 months. Have they been exacerbated by the incorrect formula for Sewerage pumping?.

We therefore continue to Object to the Proposed Development and humbly ask the Committee to defer their decision, until the full facts are established and the ongoing odour nuisance is fully resolved:

My husband retired to Longborough 'home roots' over 25 years ago. His Mother grew up in Moreton, his Grandfather being a tenant farmer of Blenheim Farm. Now the Blenheim Park Estate. This forms part of the Housing Plan. The proposed development does not.

Thank you for your attention.

CD, 9631 - Supporter's Representation

Supporting Application n.17/0032/OUT By Jenny Hitchman. May 10th 2017

I have lived in Longborough for 36 years and was the area post lady until I retired 15 years ago. Until then, almost all the houses were occupied full time. The village was vibrant; householders would open their doors to pass the time of day with me. But now when I deliver flyers round the village, large blocks of the older houses are empty. From the village shop to the church there are 14 cottages and only 2 are occupied by permanent residents, it is a very sad situation.

I went to the Housing Meeting on January 11th and was surprised that some people were against this planning application. I spoke out in favour of the proposed new development and over the next few days, many people who live in the village full time, approached me to say how glad they were that I had spoken out because they felt strongly, as I did, that we desperately ^{live} need new houses here, both affordable and market value. Following this, I popped a questionnaire through the letterboxes of all the full-time residents, asking how they felt about the proposed development and received very positive responses.

We are so fortunate that this is one of very few villages that benefit from a school, church, shop, pub and village hall and this has only been possible through steady growth in the size of the village. We desperately want to keep our school thriving. A few years ago it was the village residents who fought so hard to save it from closure. The shop is an invaluable part of the community where we can all meet for coffee and a chat. We can buy our newspapers and fresh local daily produce plus much more.

Without new houses we could lose both within a few years and then Longborough will become an empty place where second homes and holiday cottages predominate and the community will no longer thrive.

There were similar protests against the building of Plum Tree Close with concerns about noise, crime and anti-social behaviour, all completely unfounded. In fact, we have five children from there at the village school, three teenagers have learnt to bell ring at St James and one of the Mums works in the village shop. The residents are an added blessing to our community and *all houses are occupied.*

In recent years many retired people have come to live in Longborough and they are a welcome addition to village life, but we need to restore the balance. There are a number of young people who would like to remain or return to their home village where they were brought up and went to school, but current house prices make it impossible for the next generation to afford housing here.

As a long term resident I care deeply about the future of our village. We have an incredible community spirit here and whatever the outcome concerning this application, we will endeavour to keep the old and new residents working to achieve a happy and balanced future for Longborough.

CD. 1647/4 - Town Council Representation

Good morning I represent Morton in Marsh Town Council and speak in favour of the application before you.

Morton in Marsh is a small market town situated in North Cotswolds, this would lead one to believe that it is an affluent area and certainly taken against national statistics it would appear to be. Although over 69% of the population fall within C1, C2 and DE categories. Which places Morton in Marsh by a current statistic within the second highest deprivation band for income in the County the second highest deprivation band for income affecting children and the second highest level on the index of multiple deprivation. Showing that behind an apparent affluent facade there is a sizeable level rural deprivation. The proposal here is for and Aldi supermarket. Aldi according to the Grocer Magazine currently draws over 69% of its customers from C1, C2 and DE categories. This is the reason why so many in the town feel that Aldi would be a positive addition to the Town. The need for a supermarket in the price bracket catering for such a large percentage of the population should be unquestionable and a need not currently met by the existing retailers either due to pricing or product range.

The Town Council as you have weighed ^{ed} these facts against the quite reasonable objections from many others. Such as the additional congestion on the A429, although this has been covered by Gloucestershire Highways as not having a severe impact. Also the affect on the existing retailers in the town but this has already been examined both within this committee and by the Court of Appeal with both bodies minded to support a similar application. Or the effect on the AONB but this objection is full and clearly dealt with on pages 57-60 of your Officers report.

Bearing all this in mind Morton in Marsh Town council could come to but one conclusion and concur with The findings of your officer that this application would have no adverse impact on Morton in Marsh and I would urge you to come to the same conclusion and support this application.

CT, 8494/B - Parish Council Representation

Record of Comments

10th May, 2017

Reference 16/02407/FUL

I am speaking on behalf of Down Ampney Parish Council to make clear our support for the application at All Saints Church.

There is great concern at the imminent prospect of space running out in the ancient graveyard. Numerous events have taken place to raise in excess of £4000 for the groundworks and surveys, including the March 2016 Tier 1 report by BWB. This shows the level of community commitment.

Residents are facing emotional stress at the possibility of the project failing as a result of the EA intervention. All Saints Church has great significance to parishioners and the closure of the graveyard would mean they could no longer be buried or interred in the place they love. To have to be buried at a municipal cemetery would be a deeply upsetting prospect for many. The ancient church has a notable heritage, not least with its links to the Arnhem campaign and the graves of veterans; widows would in all likelihood be denied burial with them. This is a transgression of human rights.

Time does not permit me to cover all of the scientific argument submitted in my letter but I shall address a few salient points.

It is important to take into account context when applying the precautionary principle. We are not considering dangers such as high radioactivity but are assessing the effect of naturally occurring organic and nitrogenous decay compounds in low concentrations within the wider environment. A cautious regulatory approach to the risk of leachate would be justified in a large, urban graveyard; however, the village graveyard extension will be for only a few burials each year. When the consequence of an overly cautious interpretation has such potential for community upset, it should be considered very carefully.

The EA recommends an 'objection', on the precautionary principle that water might rise into the 1m 'unsaturated' margin below a burial plot. However, the weight of survey evidence in the BWB report does not justify an objection. Indeed, anecdotal evidence from gravediggers indicates no water has been observed over at least the last five years, even when digging double graves, and the proposed land is level or higher than the current graveyard.

Regulations require new or extended graveyards to be more than 250m away from potable sources and this is met by a large margin; there is no surface abstraction within 500m and the nearest source for irrigation is 670m away. It is also worth taking into account the load

of leachate created by the death of wild fauna in the local area and I suggest this must be considerable in relation to burial leaching.

Returning to the Tier 1 report, the critical finding to support the application is unambiguous: **the summary in Section 5 (Pollutant Linkage Assessment) concludes “the risk to water presented by burials in the graveyard to be LOW”.**

I suggest respectfully that this evidence, coupled with the great importance to the community of achieving the graveyard extension, should merit approval of the application.

In mitigation of any marginal issues of concern to the EA, ~~and~~ to ensure approval from the committee, the applicants and Parish Council would be prepared, albeit reluctantly, to accept a condition that double-depth graves will not be used in the graveyard extension until deemed acceptable by the Environment Agency, following any new surveys and/or analysis.

Antony Matthews
Vice-Chairman
Down Ampney PC

* Time elapsed here

CT. 8494/B - Applicant's Representation

GRAVEYARD EXTENSION ALL SAINTS CHURCH DOWN AMPNEY

A graveyard has been in existence on this site for at least seven hundred years, mostly when the villagers used the local ground water for drinking and cooking without apparent harm. Now that the main village is further away and on higher ground and no-one uses the ground water for domestic purposes, it is hard to see what additional hazards might now ensue. The proposed site is further away from the Down Ampney Brook, giving even more time for impurities to be leached out.

Where the EA regulations might be pertinent to an urban setting where they might have as many burials in a week as we, in our rural setting, have in a year, the same stringent regulations surely cannot be applied without some leeway being allowed for Councils to exercise common sense in their application.

As a church community we would also resist the possible ban on double internments in the new site. Couples who have spent a lifetime together find immense comfort at the last in the thought of being together in death too. There are practical difficulties in the alternative of reserving adjacent sites for surviving spouses, in that available space would very soon be used up. This would deny those with a residential right of burial from being buried where spaces are still vacant, but reserved for spouses who may have remarried and might not wish to take up their allotted space. In practical terms the church and the community would soon face seeking further burial space only a few decades down the line.

The villagers have already grasped with enthusiasm their new burial ground and the prospect of being laid to rest within the arms of the village community they have come to love. There have been fund-raising activities over the past two years, now standing at over £6,000; an impressive sum for such a small community, showing the depth of community commitment. A visit to our existing churchyard with its abundance of flowers on carefully tended graves is proof indeed how much the churchyard means to the villagers of Down Ampney. It is a statement of the durability of the community and family spirit and is a manifestation of the importance of roots to our community and a tribute to its past. The community would be immensely the poorer without such a facility within its midst.



D.H. SKINNER

All Saints P.C.C.

9. MAY 2017

CD, 3972/N - Applicant's Representation

Replacement Dwelling at Studio Barn, Hidcote Boyce, GL55 6LT

Planning Application 17/00004/FUL

Introduction – Name – Profession – Family

Overview – Proposal is a like for like layout.

Contemporary reinterpretation of the existing property in layout and materiality.
Of its' time, of its' place.
More than that – good design is relevant for today and for tomorrow.
Futureproofed.

Process – Pre-application guidance sought and actioned.

Led to a greater understanding of Planning Policy and rationale.
Led to a substantial redesign of original proposal with a complete rethink of the outbuilding size, location and execution.
More parameters led to a more creative solution.

Justification – As per officer's report, the proposal is deemed to be compliant with the relevant policies relating to a replacement dwelling.

But more than that – it is about how to create a home and a balanced environment for encouraging biodiversity.
Most of the AONB is shaped by agriculture. The proposal is intended to 'straddle' the site in a way that precludes further development and preserves the wild nature of the site.

Design – 'Modernist' principles applied to a Cotswold context.

Proposal may be perceived as a contemporary design – but modernism is almost a century old!
Enduring relevance and longevity through careful design and 'reductive' approach.
An efficient 'machine' for living in, but, with the Cotswold context, it has a relevance, warmth and a balance with nature at its core, to enable a good quality of life for all inhabitants of the site.

Cotswold Design Code – states contemporary design is acceptable, desirable even, in appropriate and isolated settings. ~~This proposal is appropriate to that statement.~~

~~A well considered and holistic response to the setting and an opportunity to show how contemporary efficient design and Cotswold aesthetic are not incompatible.~~ **STET**

Description – Dwelling occupies under 4% of the area of the site.

Positioned to be more covert and out of view but also to harvest rainwater to feed into adjacent pond which currently suffers from stagnation and annual drying up.
The stepped ground level means the visible volume of the dwelling, the upper floor, is all that is visible from the public footpath, with the semi mirror glass reflecting the surroundings and further minimising visual impact by making much of the volume 'invisible'.
Glazing is oriented north/south and away from any public viewpoints so there is no chance of reflected sunlight issues.
View from the road will be less visible than the existing dwelling.

Comments – Our neighbours, the people who will be most affected by this proposal, have put their support in writing. They experienced Studio Barn when it was a youth hostel, they witnessed other parties trying to secure the site with a view to developing into multiple holiday homes. They want to see an uplift to the site and a single family occupancy.

Summary – A single dwelling positioned to preclude further development

A proposal that is respectful of context, with heritage and modernity in balance.
Of its' time, of its' place.

CT. 5542/B - Applicant's Representation

CDC Application 16/03890FUL : Mr. and Mrs. T.I. Morris, Coneygar Farm Quenington, GL7 5BZ

Good morning - I am Julia Morris. My husband Tim & I are applying to convert one of our redundant farm buildings into a residential unit. Having reached retirement age, we wish gradually to hand over the management of the farm to our son. The Morris family have lived at Coneygar Farm since 1959. Tim & I are the second generation & we moved into the farmhouse in 1985, when my father-in-law took a step back. Now, continuing the cyclical nature of farming, it is time for our son to move into the farmhouse & we, with your approval, will convert the adjacent Coach House and move in there.

Our farmyard is a fine example of a Victorian farmstead with many buildings of a high quality, but not listed. The Coach House is a particularly fine building but is in poor condition internally due to age & redundancy. The proposed conversion will restore the building, ensuring its survival for future generations, whilst at the same time providing the logical solution to our retirement.

Since submitting our application nine months ago, we have modified many aspects of the design in response to the concerns of your planning officer. In particular, we have endeavoured to keep the front of the building which faces into the farmyard as unchanged as possible with no new openings in the stone work. The design of the proposed extension at the rear of the building has been completely revised to what now, might be seen as a modern equivalent of a Victorian greenhouse or orangery.

From meetings and correspondence with your officer, we gather that she is happy firstly to allow conversion of the building to residential use and secondly that she is willing to overrule conservation objections to having an extension. This leaves only the issue of the size of the extension as an obstacle to the granting of consent.

As requested, the **length** of the extension has been reduced to allow the quoins of the old building to stand out, but reducing the **width** to **less than 3** metres would not meet the needs of our declining years, not even allowing wheelchair access.

In more general terms, we feel our project fits well the principles of sustainable development as defined in your policies. The economic and social benefits to our family business, our employees and the local community clearly outweigh any perceived loss – and indeed Councillor Theodoulou has stated that he doesn't believe there will be 'any adverse impact'. Environmentally, we have always taken our role as guardians of the land and buildings seriously.

It is not an exaggeration to state that this project will enable successful transition to the next generation and determine the future of our family farm.

We therefore respectfully ask that you approve our application,

Thank you for your time and attention.