

**PLANNING AND LICENSING COMMITTEE**

**9<sup>th</sup> August 2017**

**ADDITIONAL PAGES UPDATE**

---

**DISTRIBUTED AT THE COMMITTEE MEETING**

**AVAILABLE FOR PUBLIC INSPECTION UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF THE  
LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION) ACT 1985**

**Additional Representations on Schedule Items**

**Pages 4 - 8**

PLANNING AND LICENSING COMMITTEE

9<sup>th</sup> August 2017

ADDITIONAL PAGES ON SCHEDULE ITEMS

Item	Ref. No	Content
01	17/02108/FUL CD.6682/K	<p><b>Update from NHS Gloucestershire Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG), which includes an extract from a progress report provided at the last CCG Primary Care Commissioning Committee in July 2017 -</b></p> <p>Stow surgery proposal</p> <p>In March 2016, The Primary Care Commissioning Committee confirmed their continued support for the previously agreed scheme. However, it was noted that this was subject to a Value for Money report being issued by the District Valuer. Final technical sign-off was delegated to the Chair of the Committee and the Accountable Officer to confirm the level of rent to reimburse to the practice.</p> <p>The CCG has been informed by the developer that the scheme can be delivered within the financial envelope of £144k excluding VAT per annum to cover annual lease payments. It should be noted this is the maximum level of reimbursement deemed value for money by the District Valuer. The CCG is waiting for the District Valuer to issue their Value for Money report, which is expected imminently. This means final sign off the scheme (previously delegated to Chair of PCCC and Accountable officer) can take place.</p> <p>In-line with previous agreement, the CCG is also supporting the practice with £74k to contribute to legal, commercial and project management costs related to this scheme, which is in line with NHS regulations (premises directions 2013).</p> <p>From the CCG perspective there is nothing further for the organisation to do at this stage. Members should note that any perceived delay is essentially due to requirement to finalise a number of technical, legal and commercial aspects associated with the scheme between the developer and the practice. The CCG is hopeful these can all be completed soon and mean that the Practice and their developer can move forward to deliver practical completion.</p>

		<p>However, if this scheme was not to go ahead because the Practice decide to pursue another scheme (e.g. a proposal for a GP surgery on the Gypsy Field site receiving planning permission), whilst the CCG is committed to funding a new surgery in the town and we have never expressed a specific site preference, (just that the site is convenient and accessible for patients) there is no NHS approved scheme for the Gypsy Field site. The CCG would need to review the proposal and the financial appraisal in detail.</p> <p>There is also the issue of fee support provided to the practice to help with the costs of pursuing the current scheme, which usually would have to be clawed back in such instances.</p> <p><b>One further letter of objection: raises similar concerns to those already set out within the Officer's report but adds the following – 'I can understand everyone's frustration that building work has not yet commenced at Tall Trees but sometimes there are processes which take longer than expected. There is nothing which indicates that a doctor's surgery on the gypsy field would be a speedier or better solution'.</b></p>
02	17/01439/FUL CD.2890/M.	<b>Letter from Agent on behalf of the Applicant's – Please see attached dated 8<sup>th</sup> August 2017.</b>

08 August 2017

Our ref: 2665L2017-08-08GODG\_

**Sent by email**

Cotswold District Council  
Trinity Road  
Cirencester  
Gloucestershire  
GL7 1PX

Dear Martin,

**Project 2665 – Land Adj. to The Mill Garden, Blockley**

This supplementary letter has been prepared on behalf of the applicants to address objector's specific comments within your committee report. Where possible, it is not the intention to repeat the more general reasons for approval you outline within your report.

Although addressed to you, the letter is structured as a series of additional points for consideration by councillors.

1. The prevailing character of Draycott Road is of very late twentieth and twenty-first century infill development and 16m+ high cypress trees, overshadowing the junction with Station Road (see attached Google Maps image). Contrary to objection comments, the entrance to the village is some 250m east of the application site (soon to be further with approved development imminent).
2. Neither of the owners of the two historic properties further along Draycott Road have raised objections to the proposals. Neither of these buildings are Listed. The proposed development will not have any impact upon the attractive pinchpoint between The Old Silk Mill and Orchard Cottage because it will not be visible from there. It could be argued that the removal of the tall cypress trees, which are visible at this pinchpoint, would enhance the backdrop of the two historic properties and the setting of the conservation area.
3. It is not the intention of the landscape proposals to try and hide the proposed dwelling, but instead to introduce a roadside screen of native tree planting that allows filtered views in and out of the site, as is more common within a village setting. Note that irrespective of this application, the tree officer has confirmed the existing roadside trees "dominate the character of the site" and "are not considered to be in keeping with the general character of the conservation area" and, should notice be given, could be removed to expose the existing dwelling and existing flat-roofed garage.

Tyack Architects Ltd. The Mann Institute Oxford Street Moreton-in-Marsh Gloucestershire  
GL56 0LA  
tyackarchitects.com

Directors: Edward V Tyack BA (Hons) Dip Arch RIBA Teresa A Tyack BA (Hons) Dip Arch Daniel Gore BA (Hons) Dip Arch RIBA  
Associate Directors: Peter Allen Susan Casswell BA (Hons) Dip Arch RIBA Christopher Kubale Dip Arch RIBA William Stanley BA (Hons) Dip Arch RIBA Cert. Mgmt  
Registered in England No. 4153805 | RIBA Chartered Practice No. 489753P

4. The existing property, Mill Garden, is unusual in that it completely turns its back on the front (north-west) of the site. Vehicles descend from Station Road to enter from the north-west, but all reception rooms, principal doors/windows, terraces etc overlook the landscaped gardens around Blockley Brook to the rear (south-east). The front half of the site provides limited amenity to the existing property. The proposed sub-division into two plots of circa 0.45 ha and 0.13ha are both generous for 4-bedroom houses. Both plots would be considerably bigger than the Gable Mews plots on the northern side of Draycott Road (0.035ha and 0.04ha).
5. Objectors' comparisons of the relative position and length of frontages between the proposed dwelling and the 2005 Draycott Road housing are misleading. The existing Draycott Road housing is two storey, with front/principal facades elevated above the road level and a setting largely defined by car parking, either in front or alongside. In contrast, the proposed 1.5 storey dwelling would sit 6m back from the pavement edge, orientated side-on to the road. Its private front elevation would face a concealed parking court and its largely blank gable wall would be partially screened behind a band of roadside planting. Because of the reduced ground levels it would not be possible to see the full length of the roadside elevation as it would be below the road level. With a reduced ridge height the proposed dwelling would be over a storey (3.45m) lower than the nearest Draycott Road house. Two observations of both The Old Silk Mill and Orchard Cottage are that they are both situated at the back of the pavement edge and both have blank gable ends addressing the road.
6. The proposed dwelling's height is relatively higher than Mill Garden by virtue of the fact it sits at the higher natural ground level that rises across the site to the north-east. The overall height (ground floor level to ridge-height) of the proposed dwelling (7.2m) is actually less than Mill Garden's (7.7m).
7. The proposed replacement tree planting would be on the north side of the house and so could not cause overshadowing issues. There are also limited openings on the roadside elevation, minimising any future pressure on tree removal. A little bit of screening and visual containment to the site is likely to be preferable to future occupiers of the dwelling.

The proposals have been developed with officers through a pre-application consultation. During this process the length of the roadside elevation has been reduced by almost a third, the volume has been significantly reduced by 170m<sup>3</sup> and specialist landscaping, arboricultural and highways schemes have been commissioned.

The application comes before committee with the support of officers (conservation, tree, highways, landscape, planning) and, significantly, the parish has not objected.

Yours sincerely,

**Daniel Gore**  
Tyack Architects Ltd



88

