

COTSWOLD DISTRICT COUNCIL

PLANNING AND LICENSING COMMITTEE

14TH JUNE 2017

Present:

Councillor Tina Stevenson	-	Chairman
Councillor Juliet Layton	-	Vice-Chairman

Councillors -

SI Andrews	RW Dutton
AW Berry	Andrew Doherty
AR Brassington	David Fowles
Sue Coakley	RL Hughes
Alison Coggins (until 10.50 a.m.)	MGE MacKenzie-Charrington

Substitutes:

JA Harris	Dilys Neill
-----------	-------------

Observers:

Mrs. SL Jepson (until 11.50 a.m.)	SDE Parsons (from 10.00 a.m. until 12.30 p.m.)
-----------------------------------	--

Apologies:

PCB Coleman	SG Hirst
M Harris	

PL.6 VOTING AT MEETINGS OF THE PLANNING AND LICENSING COMMITTEE

The Head of Democratic Services reminded the Committee that, at its Meeting held on 13th June 2017, the Council had removed the restriction relating to Ward Members who were also Members of the Planning and Licensing Committee making/seconding Propositions/Amendments, or voting on applications within their Wards. This restriction had also been removed in relation to Substitute Members and to all Members when the Council was sitting as the Local Planning Authority. The Head of Democratic Services further explained that, despite the removal of the voting restriction, Members were still bound by the requirements of the Code of Conduct in terms of the declaration of interests and, with it, the potential impact on participation in the debate and/or voting on items; and would also need to have regard to the common law and guidance relating to issues of predisposition, predetermination and bias.

PL.7 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

(1) Member Declarations

Councillor AW Berry declared an interest in respect of application CT.0017/1/N, because he was a Trustee of the Friends of Corinium Museum.

Councillor David Fowles declared an interest in respect of application CD.2288/Y, because he had a business relationship with one of the Applicants, and he left the Meeting while that item was being determined.

Councillor Lynden Stowe had previously declared a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in respect of application CD.2288/Y, because he was one of the Applicants. Councillor Stowe was not present at this Meeting.

(2) Officer Declarations

There were no declarations of interest from Officers.

PL.8 SUBSTITUTION ARRANGEMENTS

Councillor JA Harris substituted for Councillor M Harris.

Councillor Dilys Neill substituted for Councillor PCB Coleman.

PL.9 MINUTES

RESOLVED that:-

(a) the Minutes of the Meeting of the Committee held on 10th May 2017 be approved as a correct record;

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

(b) the Minutes of the Meeting of the Committee held on 16th May 2017 be approved as a correct record.

Record of Voting - for 11, against 0, abstentions 3, absent 1.

PL.10 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman expressed sympathy for the people affected by the fire at Grenfell Tower, London.

PL.11 PUBLIC QUESTIONS

No public questions had been submitted.

PL.12 MEMBER QUESTIONS

No questions had been received from Members.

PL.13 PETITIONS

PL.14 No petitions had been received.
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.3972/N

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 existing and proposed roof heights and materials; and landscaping. The Case Officer displayed an aerial photograph of the site and photographs illustrating views of the existing building, into the site from various vantage points and of the materials proposed, a virtual Google Street view of the area, and images of the proposed development which had been supplied by the Applicant.

The Applicant was invited to address the Committee.

The Chairman referred to the Sites Inspection Briefing undertaken in respect of this application, and invited those Members who had attended that Briefing to express their views. A number of Members pointed out that the site was significantly lower than the surrounding land, was well-screened and that only glimpses of the existing building were afforded. Those Members did not consider that the proposed development would have any adverse impact on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or neighbouring buildings.

The Ward Member, who did not serve on the Committee, was invited to address the Committee and expressed the hope that those Members who had attended the Sites Inspection Briefing had been able to get an appreciation of Hidcote

Boyce. The Ward Member stated that the hamlet attracted a large number of tourists who wished to take in a 'pocket of history' including a number of Cotswold stone cottages. The Ward Member reminded the Committee that tourism was a major industry in the District, and considered this hamlet to be one of the areas of the Cotswolds that tourists wished to visit. The Ward Member contended that the Council should seek to protect and conserve its special landscapes, and that the proposed development would have an adverse impact on this part of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The Ward Member considered the proposed building to be well-designed, but expressed the opinion that this was not the correct location for it, and that its size and the proposed materials would harm the setting. The Ward Member explained that, at a recent Meeting, the Parish Council had sustained its previous objections to this proposal and concluded by stating that an application should not be approved because the proposed development would be 'out of sight'.

In response to a question from a Member, it was reported that all interested parties should have received notification that this application would be determined at this current Meeting.

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

Some Members welcomed what they considered to be an innovative design. Those Members considered that, while the Council had a duty to preserve the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, it should continue to consider such designs which could become indicative of their time in the future. It was suggested that this proposal would result in the replacement of an existing building with one which was considered to be significantly more attractive, and which was in keeping with the area. It was considered that this proposal would not have any adverse impact on the area and that the design and the setting of the proposed building within the site had been well-thought out and that care had been taken over the selection of materials. This was a large site and it was suggested that the ecological credentials of this proposal were exceptional and that the development would enhance the site as the materials weathered and the proposed planting matured. Another Member commented that this site was some distance away from historic buildings in the hamlet.

The Ward Member was invited to address the Committee again, and commented that, while the Parish Council had been aware of the Sites Inspection Briefing undertaken in respect of this application, it had not been aware that the application was going to be considered at this Meeting. The Planning and Development Manager undertook to check that the correct notification had been sent to all interested parties.

Approved, as recommended.

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

CT.9101/A

Construction of two new semi-detached dwellings at land at Backs Lane, Ampney Crucis -

The Case Officer drew attention to the extra representation received since publication of the Schedule of Planning Applications, and the Chairman allowed a

period of time for Members to read the representation 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 proximity to other residential properties, the Conservation Area boundary and another site where permission had been granted for new developments; an existing agricultural building on the site which was proposed for demolition; elevations; a block plan; and materials. The Case Officer displayed an aerial photograph, and photographs illustrating views into the site from various vantage points and from within the site.

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

The Ward Member, who served on the Committee, was invited to address the Committee and amplified his reasons for referring this application to the Committee for determination. In referring to the recent decision by the Council to lift restrictions on Members voting on planning applications etc. in their Wards, the Ward Member stated that he had not predetermined this application and would listen to the debate before deciding how he would vote.

The Ward Member considered that a recent decision by the Council relating to the Emerging Local Plan should enable the Committee to attach more weight to that Plan in its determination of planning applications. The Ward Member contended that, while there was a presumption in the Emerging Local Plan in favour of sustainable development, Ampney Crucis was not a sustainable settlement, and he amplified his reasons for that contention. The Ward Member reminded the Committee that this site was currently agricultural land, which was outside the Conservation Area. The Ward Member drew attention to the access along a narrow lane which, he considered, was dangerous, and he expressed the view that the proposed development could conflict with the linear development of the village and that it would be unlikely to be used as accommodation for agricultural workers. The Ward Member reminded the Committee that an application for a bungalow near to this site had been refused in 2016, and he concluded by reiterating his previous comments relating to predetermination.

In response to various questions, it was reported that the lane was an adopted highway; the agricultural buildings adjacent to this site were in the Applicant's ownership; the previous application which had been referred to by the Ward Member had been on another site on the opposite side of the road to this current site; no objections had been received from the Environmental Health Officer in relation to this application; the demolition of the existing agricultural building would be subject to separate legislation under the Health and Safety Executive; in the opinion of Officers, this was not an isolated site; no Development Boundary had been proposed for Ampney Crucis in the Emerging Local Plan; Officers were not aware of any proposals by the Parish Council to produce a Neighbourhood Development Plan; the Applicant's intention was to provide two additional houses for rental on the open market; in the event that the Committee was minded to approve this application as recommended, no case had been made in support of an agricultural occupancy restriction being attached to any Decision Notice; the Committee would be able to attribute more weight to the Emerging Local Plan as it proceeded towards submission for adoption; under the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), each scheme for residential development counted towards the Council's five-year supply of housing land and could contribute to the local economy; the Council should avoid applying 'blanket'

restrictions to developments without justification for doing so; in determining applications, the Committee should consider connections to nearby settlements and assess each application on a case-by-case basis, as well as assessing any environmental harm that could arise; in the opinion of Officers, Emerging Local Plan Policy DS3 accorded with the provisions of the NPPF; agricultural land was excluded from the definition of a 'brown field' site; and the other existing buildings were situated 54.5 metres from the site boundary.

A number of Members expressed support for this proposal. The delivery of two residential units, potentially for rent, in this location was considered to be acceptable. Those Members referred to the existing facilities in the village, and it was contended that demolition of the existing agricultural building and the provision of housing would result in an improvement of this site. It was further contended that communities should be able to evolve and that this proposal would accord with the linear nature of the village. Other Members expressed the view that there was currently no identified need for this type of housing in the village, and expressed concern over issues relating to access. Those Members contended that Ampney Crucis constituted a 'balanced' settlement, and they reiterated their view that there was no identified need for the proposed development.

In response to some further questions from Members, it was reported that, if the Committee was minded to approve this application as recommended, a condition requiring the submission of a Construction Method Statement could be attached to any Decision Notice, and that it would not be reasonable for the Council to seek to condition maintenance of the highway during the construction period.

A Proposition, that this application be approved as recommended including a condition relating to the submission of a Construction Method Statement, was duly Seconded.

Approved as recommended, subject to an additional condition to be specified by the Case Officer relating to the submission of a Construction Method Statement.

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

CD.3919/D

Erection of 4-bed cottage with detached garage at Hillbarn, Westington, Chipping Campden -

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 access; the proximity of this site to a Listed Building; the proposed layout, elevations and floor plan; and sections through the site. The Case Officer displayed an aerial photograph of the site, photographs illustrating views across the site, and a virtual Google Street view of the area.

A Member of the Town Council was invited to address the Committee.

The Committee Services Manager read out comments submitted by both Ward Members, neither of whom served on the Committee and had been able to attend the Meeting. The Ward Members had amplified the reasons why they had

referred this application to the Committee for determination. They contended that this site was situated in a particularly sensitive part of Westington, which was evidenced by the number of tourists that visited the area, and they concluded by stating that the impact could only be properly assessed by Members undertaking a Sites Inspection Briefing.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that there was currently a single point of access to Hillbarn; vehicles associated with the property were usually parked on the grass verge in front of the property or on the adjacent highway; a previous application relating to this site had been dismissed on appeal in 1999; land levels rose at the entrance to the site but then fell again, so it was not considered that the proposed dwelling would be over-prominent in the landscape as it would also be set back within the site and well-screened; in the opinion of Officers, there was no justification to support a refusal of this application for reasons relating to a lack of on-site parking provision; and there was an existing outbuilding on the site which was associated with Hillbarn.

A Proposition, that consideration of this application be deferred for a Sites Inspection Briefing, 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 8, abstentions 2, absent 2.

It was reported that the issue of a potential second access had been discussed at the appeal against the refusal of the previous application relating to this site, but that, to date, the Applicant had not chosen to take up that issue. It was suggested that, if this was the only remaining concern for the Committee, Officers could explore the option with the Applicant, but that it would not be reasonable to do so if it was a matter of preference. In determining this application, the Committee should consider if the perceived harm outweighed any benefits that would accrue from the development.

A Member expressed the view that this proposal constituted an improvement over the previous proposal on this site. The Member expressed concern over the parking arrangements but stated that she supported the Officer recommendation.

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

Another Member referred to the objections received, including from the Parish Council. The Member contended that this proposal could have an adverse impact on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, and the amenities of neighbouring properties, and expressed concern over the lack of on-site parking. The Member stated that he did not support the further Proposition.

In response, it was reported that the Committee should consider parking issues in its determination of this application, but that it should only be refused for reasons relating to parking if a severe impact could be demonstrated. It was further reported that, in the opinion of Officers, that was not the case on this occasion and that the Committee could approve this application as recommended, having considered the amenity impact of off-site parking, if it was satisfied that the benefits of the proposal outweighed any harm.

Approved, as recommended.

Record of Voting - for 9 against 4, abstentions 0, absent 2.

CT.8950/E**Variation of Condition 3 (agricultural occupancy) of permission 15/00655/FUL to enable approved dwelling to be occupied in connection with equestrian activities in addition to agriculture at Clay Meadow, Cirencester Road, South Cerney -**

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 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 proximity to South Cerney and a previous application in 2015 seeking permission to diversify into equestrian activities.

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 stated that his comments also related to the subsequent application on this site (application CT.7622/D referred). The Ward Member expressed the view that both applications depended on each other and that, if the Committee was minded to refuse the subsequent application, the variation of condition sought under this current application would become unnecessary.

The Ward Member contended that the barn proposed under the subsequent application was proposed to be situated in an elevated position, and he expressed concerns over issues relating to the scale, design and style which, he contended, were inappropriate for the proposed location. The Ward Member referred to the reasons for the proposed diversification which had been put forward by the Applicant, and questioned the need for two foaling boxes, as Exmoor ponies bred outside in the wild. The Ward Member commented that if cover was needed, there were already mobile shelters and a barn available on the site. In conclusion, the Ward Member contended that an upgrade to the previously-submitted business plan should have been submitted in support of the proposed diversification, due to the likely scale thereof.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that, if the Committee was minded to approve this current application as proposed, the variation of the agricultural occupancy condition to include equestrian activities would strengthen the ability of the Council to resist any future application to convert the building to an open market dwelling; it was possible to graze horses on agricultural land without the need for planning permission, but permission for a Change of Use would be required for the keeping of horses; and it was likely that ponies would be kept on this site regardless of the decision on the subsequent application.

Another Member referred to information submitted previously in respect of the existing alpaca farm, and commented that there were other equestrian facilities in close proximity to this site. The Member commented that this site was landlocked, and did not benefit from any bridleways, and that the handling of animals was not a planning consideration.

The Ward Member was invited to address the Committee again, and he commented that he did not have any issues with this current application.

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

Approved, as recommended.

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

CT.7622/D

Change of Use of parcel of land from agriculture to equestrian, the erection of a stable building and associated groundworks at Clay Meadow, Cirencester Road, South Cerney -

The Case Officer reminded the Committee of the location of this site and outlined the proposals, drawing attention to the extent of the Applicant's landholding in this area and the proximity of the site to a public right of way. The Case Officer displayed photographs illustrating views of the access, along the highway, through the site and from the public right of way.

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 he had made all of his comments in relation to the previous application (application CT.8950/E above referred).

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that the Applicant's total landholding comprised some 10 hectares; the trees growing at the front of the site were fruit trees; the trees growing to the rear of the site had been planted in order to screen the site from public views; the issue of other, similar businesses in the vicinity of this site was not a relevant planning matter; there were two existing barns on the southern boundary of the site, an office building and a chalet that would be replaced by the building approved under the a previous application, and the alpaca shelter; and that the area comprised an open landscape with a number of substantial buildings.

It was considered that this was a viable business which was seeking to expand, and that the barn was of a reasonable size for the activities proposed, and that it would not have any additional, harmful landscape impact.

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

Approved, as recommended.

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

CD.2288/Y**Erection of a detached dwelling (Reserved Matters application pursuant to permission 14/04050/OUT) at plot adjacent to Arbour House, Broadway Road, Mickleton -**

The Case Officer reminded the Committee of the location of this site and outlined the proposals, drawing attention to its location outside the Development Boundary for the village; layout; and dimensions. The Case Officer displayed photographs illustrating views of existing dwellings and those currently under construction, in the vicinity of this site.

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

Approved, as recommended.

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

CD.4187/F**Creation of a new doorway from Church Street to provide separate pedestrian access to first and second floor flat, and associated internal works at Borzoi Book Shop, White Cottage, Church Street, Stow-on-the-Wold -**

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 existing access and the existing and proposed floor plans. The Case Officer displayed photographs illustrating views of the front elevation of the building and the interior, including the cellar and the existing staircase which had been proposed for removal.

A Member of the Town Council and a Supporter were invited to address the Committee, and stated that their comments also related to the subsequent application (application CD.4187/E referred).

The Ward Member, who was serving on the Committee as a Substitute Member at this Meeting, was invited to address the Committee, and stated that her comments also related to the subsequent application (application CD.4187/E referred). The Ward Member stated that she had lived in Stow-on-the-Wold for approximately thirty years, during which time it had changed from being a market town catering for the needs of local people to one which also catered for the needs of tourists. The Ward Member explained that the bookshop in this building was a long-standing business which helped to meet the needs of local people and tourists. The Ward Member referred to the layout of the shop and the problems experienced in gaining access to the upper floors. The Applicants had lived 'over the shop' until 2004, after which time the upper floors had been rented out. However, the Ward Member contended that gaining access through the shop had caused problems, resulting in the upper floors being unoccupied for the past ten years, and that they were in need of repair. The Ward Member reminded the Committee that the building was not being operated as a single property, and

stated that the Applicants were reluctant to spend money to conserve the upper floors without an opportunity to get a return on such expenditure.

The Ward Member further contended that, if the use of the upper floors by the current bookshop was a viable alternative, the bookshop would have already expanded into that area. The Ward Member expressed the view that the existing staircase meant that public access was unlikely and that, further, an application for a Change of Use of the premises to wholly residential was unlikely to be approved. The Ward Member stated that, in the past, furniture and appliances had been taken into and removed from the upper floors through the first floor windows, resulting in a closure of the road to facilitate such operations. The Ward Member considered that the public benefit that would accrue from the proposals would outweigh the harm to the Listed Building and that, further, the proposed new door would soon blend into the street scene. The Ward Member commented that Listed Buildings could be altered to meet current needs and, in conclusion, suggested that it might be beneficial to defer determination of this application to enable a Sites Inspection Briefing to be held to assess the impact of the proposals on the street scene.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that the building was currently in the ownership of the Applicants; the ground floor was rented out to a third party who operated the bookshop, which was an established business; the upper floors were currently vacant; the only means of access to the upper floors was currently through the ground floor shop; the proposal to create a separate access to the upper floors required a re-configuration of the existing stairway; a previous application to create an access through the rear of the building had been refused in 2006; a potential alternative could be to create an access through an existing window but the current proposal was considered to be the least contentious option; in the opinion of Officers, removal of the existing staircase would have an adverse impact on the historic fabric and layout of the building; while Officers had concerns over the operation of the proposed trapdoor giving access to the cellar, the principal concerns related to the loss of the existing staircase; there had been a suggestion that an original fireplace existed in the south wall behind some boarding, but Officers had no evidence that such suggestion was correct; any application for a Change of Use of the premises to wholly residential would be determined on its merits if such an application was submitted; building regulations only applied to new works and, therefore, there was no general requirement to upgrade existing buildings to meet those standards; in the opinion of Officers, the existing staircase was not in a state of poor repair; and Officers considered that the alternative option for creating an additional access, which would result in the loss of an existing, original window, would be more harmful than this current proposal.

Some Members stated that, while they understood the reasons for the Officer recommendation, they considered that the benefits of this application would outweigh the loss of the existing staircase, and that the bookshop constituted an important part of the community. Those Members contended that this proposal would enable the Applicants to bring the upper floors of the building back into use, which would help to conserve the Listed Building. However, it was suggested that, if the Committee was minded to approve this application, the proposed door should be glazed.

Another Member contended that the staircase was a significant feature of the Listed Building and that, once removed, it would be lost forever. The Member reminded the Committee that, as there was existing residential accommodation on

the upper floors of this building, the proposal would not increase the amount of residential space, and that there was an option for the building to become a single residential unit. The Member further contended that approval of this application would result in the building appearing as two separate units, and she reminded the Committee that a number of buildings across the District could only get furniture and appliances in and out of the upper floors through first floor windows due to the existence of original, narrow staircases. The Ward Member considered the architecture in Stow-on-the-Wold to be one of the town's attractions, and she commented that this application would not guarantee the future viability of the bookshop. In conclusion, the Member stated that she did not support this Proposition. Another Member stated that she supported the comments regarding narrow staircases and the use of first floor windows to gain access for furniture for the upper floors.

It was reported that, if the Committee was minded to approve this application as proposed, a number of conditions would be attached to any Decision Notice, including details of the trap door to the cellar, the recording of existing historic features and the finishing of the proposed doorway.

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

Record of Voting - for 11, against 2, abstentions 0, absent 2.

Note:

This decision was contrary to the Officer recommendation because, having considered and understood the impact of the proposals, a majority of the Committee was satisfied that, on this occasion, the benefits of the proposal outweighed the harm that would be caused to the Listed Building.

CD.4187/E

Creation of a new doorway from Church Street to provide separate pedestrian access to first and second floor flat at Borzoi Book Shop, White Cottage, Church Street, Stow-on-the-Wold -

The Case Officer explained that there were no further issues to be addressed in relation to this application.

A Member of the Town Council and a Supporter were invited to address the Committee, and stated that they had made all of their comments in relation to the previous application (application CD.4187/F referred).

The Ward Member, who was serving on the Committee as a Substitute Member at this Meeting, was invited to address the Committee, and stated that she had made all of her comments in relation to the previous application (application CD.4187/F referred).

A Proposition, that this application be approved, subject to conditions to be specified by the Case Officer, to include details of the trap door to the cellar, the recording of existing historic features and the finishing of the proposed doorway, was duly Seconded.

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

Record of Voting - for 11, against 2, abstentions 0, absent 2.

Note:

This decision was contrary to the Officer recommendation because, having considered and understood the impact of the proposals, a majority of the Committee was satisfied that, on this occasion, the benefits of the proposal outweighed the harm that would be caused to the Listed Building.

CT.0017/1/N

Installation of 127 cm high satellite antenna at Corinium Museum, Park Street, Cirencester -

The Case Officer reminded the Committee of the location of this site and outlined the proposals, drawing attention to the position of the proposed antenna. The Case Officer displayed a photograph of the rooftop.

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

Approved, as recommended.

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

Further representations were reported at the Meeting in respect of application CD.3919/D

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

Councillor Mrs. SL Jepson was invited to speak on application CD.3972/N.

Councillor SDE Parsons was invited to speak on applications CT.8950/E and CT.7622/D.

(iii) Public Speaking

Public speaking took place as follows:-

- | | | |
|------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| <u>CD.3972/N</u> |) | Mr. A Wheel (Applicant) |
| <u>CT.9101/A</u> |) | Councillor Mrs. R Armitage |
| |) | (Parish Council) |
| |) | Mr. N Holt (Objector) |
| <u>CD.3919/D</u> |) | Councillor J Ellis (Town Council) |

<u>CT.8950/E</u>)	Mrs. H Kendall Smith (Applicant)
<u>CT.7622/D</u>)	Mrs. H Kendall Smith (Applicant)
<u>CD.4187/F</u>)	Councillor A White (Town Council)
)	Mr. N Worledge (Supporter)
<u>CD.4187/E</u>)	Councillor A White (Town Council)
)	Mr. N Worledge (Supporter)

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.15 SITES INSPECTION BRIEFINGS

1. Members for 5th July 2017

No applications were deferred for Sites Inspection Briefings.

2. Advance Sites Inspection Briefings

No advance Sites Inspection Briefings had been notified.

PL.16 OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business that was urgent.

The Meeting commenced at 9.30 a.m., adjourned between 11.05 a.m. and 11.15 a.m., and closed at 1.25 p.m.

Chairman

(END)