

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

Planning Application 17/00004/FUL

CS, 3972/N - Applicant's Representation

Having visited the site you will now understand the context and scale of the site and the proposal within it. You will now see that previous ^{CONCERN} statements about visibility from Hidcote House and Hidcote Gardens were incorrect. You will also have seen that the proposal is some distance from the hamlet of Hidcote Boyce.

You will also have seen from the documents and images that the proposal is for a 'modern rustic' dwelling – 'contemporary Cotswold'.

Not a clinical 'gleaming white box' at odds with the surroundings.

Not a 'yellow car in Bibury'!

We don't want to be seen. We don't want to parade ourselves on TV. We want a home for us and the surrounding wildlife.

I've set out to be the 'role model' applicant. I created an initial proposal fully understanding it was a 'stake in the ground' to work from. I engaged in the process through pre-application guidance, wanting to understand and embrace the process and policies, redesigning the proposal as required. Importantly, I researched all the replacement dwellings built in the area this century, to benchmark and understand the precedents set by CDC, then proposed a dwelling which is smaller than any of those precedents, but fit for purpose, futureproofed with high efficiency and small carbon footprint.

I also aimed to raise the standard of visual and graphic presentation, transferring skills from my day job, to help everyone understand the proposal, that contemporary forms can exist with traditional materials, to propose a dwelling that becomes as one with the site as it is enclosed by foliage, that is positioned in a way that enhances and sustains the lower pond.

Throughout the process I also embraced and respected the deadlines/timescales as laid out in CDC Planning policy.

The proposal has been determined as compliant with relevant policies, including Policy 22, by your expert team. Policies which can't be selectively applied.

The Residents Association of Hidcote Boyce discussed the proposal. There were NO objection comments submitted, but TWO letters of support. Ebrington Parish Council's objections mainly relate to design matters, inferring subjectivity, not objectivity.

NPPF – Section 7, Paragraph 56 of NPPF states 'good design is indivisible from good planning' whilst Paragraph 58 states that proposals should 'reflect identity and materials whilst not stifling innovation'. Paragraph 63 states 'great weight should be given to outstanding or innovative designs which help raise the standard of design more generally'. The Cotswold Design Code states that a Cotswold building has a rationale behind its form – everything there for a reason. It also states that 'the introduction of a modern interpretation of the Cotswold style will, in some instances, be perfectly acceptable, in fact desirable'

It continues to say that ideally this will be 'in a location not in context of an existing village'.

If this proposal and location doesn't comply with those words, then surely NOWHERE in the District can comply. *

Summary – speaking openly, I understand how this can be seen as a 'challenging' design. In my day job I work 5-10 years ahead. Anything that isn't 'challenging' at first sight is unimaginative and will quickly be seen as irrelevant/outdated. There is too much unimaginative housing design. Poor design. The creativity of the UK is not reflected in most residential design. We want to be a 'role model' for planning applicants, listening and reacting. We want to demonstrate that 'contemporary' and 'Cotswold' are NOT mutually incompatible. We want our kids to grow up in this home. We want them to bring THEIR kids to this home. We want to see the site thrive with more trees, more vibrant pond area and more diversity. We want to create a contemporary Cotswold dwelling that works for all occupants and is a consequence of its function.

Today, you decide whether all this will EXIST at all. I sincerely hope you understand it and support it.

* Time elapsed

CT.9101/A - Parish Council Representation

Objection to Application Ref: 16/05309/FUL – Two new semi-detached dwellings at land at Backs Lane, Ampney Crucis, GL7 5TE. Cllr Rosanna Armitage, Ampney Crucis Parish Council

Good morning.

The Parish Council **OBJECTS** to this application for the following reasons:

The National Planning Policy Framework has a presumption in favour of sustainable development as measured in economic, social and environmental terms.

CDC's Role and Function of Settlements Study ranked Ampney Crucis as "very limited" for provision of economic and employment activity. We have no shop or village pub.

We do have a thriving village hall, well used by villagers and others. Its future would not be positively impacted as a result of the proposed development.

CDC's study ranked our village as "very limited" for provision of public transport facilities relative to other settlements in the district.

Since then, public transport provision to and from Cirencester has worsened. The first bus to Cirencester on weekdays leaves the village at 9.16am and the last of the day returns into the village at 2.16pm.

For the brave hearted prepared to walk out of the village, cross a very fast, unlit and dangerous stretch of the A417, there is an earlier service at 7.33am, but no return service after 5.43pm.

In the winter months that means a walk along unlit village streets with very limited footpaths. In addition, there are no contiguous footpaths or cyclepaths to Cirencester.

So, Ampney Crucis fails the economic and social tests set out in the NPPF.

As regards environmental considerations, the proposed development is some 40 metres outside the Ampney Crucis Conservation Area but it would still have a negative impact in that all paved access is via the Conservation Area and any increase in traffic movements is a serious consideration.

Back(s) Lane is a very narrow (single track) lane that ultimately leads to an unmade track.

There has already been significant erosion of the grass verges by traffic going to or from other properties or sites, including Crucis Park.

Adding up to six more cars belonging to the residents of the proposed houses (plus visitors) is highly likely to worsen this situation.

The proposed site cannot be considered to be either "in-fill" or "re-use of a brownfield site". It is on land that has until now been used for agricultural purposes; development there would conflict with the established settlement pattern of the village, permanently changing the outlook onto this essentially rural area beyond the village boundary.

For all of the reasons stated, the proposed development cannot be considered to be “sustainable development” and is therefore counter to the National Planning Policy Framework.

In addition, NPPF Para 55 states that new homes in isolated locations should be avoided, unless they satisfy well defined criteria, none of which are satisfied by the proposed dwellings.

The application and its only letter of support refer to these houses being suitable for occupation by agricultural or rural estate workers.

Farming operations on this estate have been contracted out for several years, and as there is no clear statement or commitment by the applicant that they will be used solely for that purpose, they are quite clearly intended as open market housing.

The Parish Council asks you to **REFUSE** this application.

2 mins 50 secs

CT, 9101/A- Objector's Representations

Objection to Application Ref: 16/05309/FUL – Two new semi-detached dwellings at land at Backs Lane, Ampney Crucis, GL7 5TE. Neil Holt, resident, Ampney Crucis, speaking on behalf of the village objectors

Good morning.

My property backs onto the field adjacent to the development site. I would not be visually impacted and my access is not onto or via Back(s) Lane, but you may consider I have a personal interest.

I represent five residents from across Ampney Crucis who have written to CDC OBJECTING to this application.

The National Planning Policy Framework has at its heart a presumption in favour of sustainable development as measured in economic, social and environmental terms.

As you have heard from the Parish Council, our village fails the NPPF sustainability test against all three measures and CDC's own report ranks our village 29th out of 29 settlements for economic and social sustainability.

Policy 19 in the agreed Local Plan is still current, in which case this development goes counter to Policy. However, the Planning and Development Manager has advised me that greater weight is being accorded to the emerging Local Plan with specific reference to Section DS3.

So, to address the conditions in DS3:

Adding two houses does not demonstrably support or enhance the vitality of the local community and continued availability of services and facilities locally.

Ampney Crucis has a village hall – already very well used by people inside and outside the village. It is not at risk.

Village bus services are very limited – CDC has acknowledged that in published studies.

The village school is not at risk – with 94 pupils, it is already oversubscribed for current and planned accommodation, and would not benefit from further development in the village.

The proposed development does not enhance sustainable patterns of development or complement the form and character of the settlement.

It is on land that has until now been used for agricultural purposes; development there would conflict with the established settlement pattern of the village.

It would also encourage a linear pattern of development that is out of character and not sustainable, by virtue of its only access being along a very narrow single track lane with a dead end.

The proposed development would have an adverse impact on the settlement in that the only vehicle access to Back(s) Lane is via Butcher's Arms Lane, itself single track with just

one passing place, or along the Village Street, which is also single track in several places, and elsewhere, residents' parked cars render it so.

The Village Street and Butcher's Arms Lane are already heavily used at peak times and throughout the day, as a "rat run" for commercial vehicles and cars cutting off the corner between the A419 at South Cerney and the Burford Road.

Adding two, three bedroomed houses would increase traffic potentially by at least 12 movements per day, onto a very busy, narrow lane already incapable of supporting any significant increase in traffic.

Finally, Members should be aware of an earlier application (Ref 16/00521/FUL) for demolition of stables and construction of a new bungalow, also off Back Lane about 70 metres from the site proposed today. It was refused in April 2016 as recommended by the Case Officer, yet there is no apparent difference between the arguments in favour of this application and the earlier refused one.

On behalf of village residents, I ask you to **REFUSE** this application.

2 mins 55 secs

CD.3919/D - Town Council Representations

COTSWOLD DISTRICT COUNCIL PLANNING AND LICENSING COMMITTEE, 14 JUNE 2017

Application CD.3919/D Erection of 4-bed cottage with detached garage at Hillbarn, Westington, Chipping Campden, GL55 6EG.

Objection to Application from Chipping Campden Town Council "The Council"

The Council objects strongly to this application and the recommendation to permit from the Case Officer.

The Committee is considering this application because of the number and strength of objections from the Council, Campden Society and residents, several of which give more detailed reasons for the application's non-compliance with Local Plan policies than my time allows.

The site is not within the current Development boundary as stated, as the draft Local Plan includes an extension to the boundary which takes in the site. The site is within the Conservation Area and the AONB. The Council is objecting to the extension of the development boundary, and will be making the objection to the Local Plan examination.

The previous application, for a 3 bedroom development, was rejected by the District Council, (despite being recommended for permit by the then Case Officer), and subsequently at appeal. This application is for a 4 bedroom house, not cottage.

The application does not meet any housing need criteria, and the District Council as a whole has a supply of permitted housing well over 5 years. This application therefore is in breach of NPPF Paragraph 115.

Approval of this infill development within the Conservation Area will create a dangerous precedent which will inflict future harm on the environment and setting of the town.

The Council urges the Committee to reject this opportunistic and harmful application.

CS. 4187 / F and / E - Town Council Representatives

Borzo Bookshop, White Cottage, Stow on the Wold

Stow Town Council attaches great importance to the conservation of the town's historic centre.

This is instanced by the fact that we have a track record of drawing the District Council's attention to unauthorized works carried out on listed buildings.

It should be noted that in most of these instances authorization has been given retrospectively, typically at officer level.

The proposers of the current application have persistently sought to obtain authority before beginning work rather than chancing their arm as so many others have done in Stow and other historic settlements.

They have done so in order to sustain a much valued bookshop which is of benefit to the local community and the wider area in the teeth of online competition. Refusal of this application would increase the risk of closure.

Historic England characterizes the harm to be done as minimal and simply ask for it to be balanced against the benefits of permanent residential occupancy. This is in direct contradiction to your Conservation Officer's observation that the harm involved is considerable.

In Stow Council's view the potential loss to the community of the excellent Borzoi bookshop would cause considerably greater disbenefit to the public than the minimal harm involved in the proposed works.

We urge the Committee to approve the applications.

World Bank - White Paper on the World

Low-Tech Countries - reaches great importance to the preservation of the
low-tech countries

It is estimated by the fact that we have a great deal of drawing the
District Councils of action to the fact that we have a great deal of
drawing

It is estimated by the fact that we have a great deal of drawing the
District Councils of action to the fact that we have a great deal of
drawing

It is estimated by the fact that we have a great deal of drawing the
District Councils of action to the fact that we have a great deal of
drawing

It is estimated by the fact that we have a great deal of drawing the
District Councils of action to the fact that we have a great deal of
drawing

It is estimated by the fact that we have a great deal of drawing the
District Councils of action to the fact that we have a great deal of
drawing

It is estimated by the fact that we have a great deal of drawing the
District Councils of action to the fact that we have a great deal of
drawing

It is estimated by the fact that we have a great deal of drawing the
District Councils of action to the fact that we have a great deal of
drawing

Introduction

Good morning/afternoon etc.

My name is NW and I have been asked by the applicants Mr and Mrs Whittingham as their heritage consultant to explain to you the thinking behind this proposal and the issues we consider to be relevant.

Background and policy

This proposal seeks a solution that can allow the upper floors of this listed building to be used.

Historic England and government explain that the best way to sustain historic buildings is to make sure they have a viable use, pointing out that to keep a historic building in use will require continual adaptation and change.

This is particularly pertinent for the upper floors of shops in town centres, many of which are vulnerable to underuse or have no use. Historic England and its predecessors have long promoted 'Living over the Shop' (LOTS scheme), not only in helping to secure the use of upper floors of historic buildings but also as a mechanism to help maintain the viability and vitality of town centres.

Indeed The Council's Local Plan (2011) endorses the LOTS initiative stating

Many floors above shops and other commercial premises in town centres are under-used or empty. The Council is keen to encourage the more effective use of upper floors, particularly where this will provide residential use

Developing the proposal

Only using the ground floor of a three storey building is not sustainable. Change is necessary if this building is to have a secure future. We recognize that understanding the heritage significance the building holds is important in order to inform the nature and extent of those changes.

In terms of its significance:

- The building is not remarkable but it is typical in layout, use of materials and appearance of many town centre buildings, contributing to our understanding of the history of Stow in the Wold and
- our enjoyment of the Cotswold vernacular.
- It has value as part of a group of historic buildings in the street.
- Internally it has been altered and there is a flat roof extension to the rear, which has affected its historical integrity and aesthetic

There are some challenges in finding the right solution:-

- There is no rear access to the rear other than through the shop.
- Attempts to negotiate a rear access with neighbours, as part of an application for planning permission and listed building consent for a rear external staircase to the first floor from the garden, failed and in any event planning permission and listed building consent were refused.
- That only viable option left is access from the street.

Assessing the impacts

It is accepted that the proposal involves intervention and loss of some building fabric but this is the minimum necessary if the upper floors are to be used.

In seeking to find the right solution I would like to make some observations:

- The provision of a door alongside the shop has historic precedents with examples in the same street
- The staircase to be removed is in poor condition . Dating from the mid 19th century date it is typical but not rare. If it could be retained it would

be. The interest it holds could be recorded by photograph and description to mitigate its loss preserving it 'by record'

- The steps to the basement will remain and be accessible
- The new staircase will be hidden from view through the shop front by the shop window displays and has been designed to minimise any loss of shop floorspace

The proposal will deliver significant **public benefits**:

- Sustaining the listed building by ensuring its full use
- Contributing to the vitality and viability of the town centre
- Occupancy introduces 'natural' surveillance within the town helping to combat crime and perceptions of crime or anti social behaviour

Conclusion

The proposal has been informed by research and understanding of the history of the place and the significance it holds. It seeks to minimise any harm and we believe that it is justified by the public benefits the proposal will deliver.

We hope you can support the applications.