

COTSWOLD DISTRICT COUNCIL

PLANNING AND LICENSING COMMITTEE

13<sup>TH</sup> SEPTEMBER 2017

Present:

Councillor RL Hughes - Chairman  
Councillor Juliet Layton - Vice-Chairman

Councillors -

SI Andrews	RW Dutton
AW Berry	David Fowles
AR Brassington (until 2.50 p.m.)	M Harris
Sue Coakley	SG Hirst
Alison Coggins	MGE MacKenzie-Charrington
PCB Coleman (from 9.32 a.m.)	LR Wilkins
Andrew Doherty	

Observers:

Mrs. SL Jepson (until 10.40 a.m.)      RG Keeling

PL.38      DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

(1)      Member Declarations

Councillor Mark F Annett had previously declared a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in respect of application 17/02783/FUL, because he owned an adjacent property. Councillor Annett was not present at the Meeting while this application was being determined.

Councillor David Fowles declared an interest in respect of application 17/02525/FUL, because he worked with a Son of the Applicant.

Councillor David Fowles declared an interest in respect of application 17/02598/FUL, because he was acquainted with the Objector.

Councillor Lynden Stowe had previously declared a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in respect of application 17/02525/FUL, because he was the Son of the Applicant. Councillor Stowe was not present at the Meeting while this application was being determined.

Councillor Lynden Stowe had declared an interest in respect of application 17/02783/FUL, because he was acquainted with the owner of an adjacent property.

Councillor LR Wilkins declared an interest in respect of application 17/02241/FUL, because he had employed the Agent to carry out some work on his behalf.

Councillor LR Wilkins declared an interest in respect of application 17/02263/FUL, because he was acquainted with the public speakers.

(2) Officer Declarations

There were no declarations of interest from Officers.

PL.39 SUBSTITUTION ARRANGEMENTS

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

PL.40 MINUTES

**RESOLVED that the Minutes of the Meeting of the Committee held on 9<sup>th</sup> August 2017 be approved as a correct record.**

**Record of Voting - for 13, against 0, abstentions 2, absent 0.**

Arising thereon:

Advance Sites Inspection Briefings (PL.36(2))

It was reported that, subsequent to the Meeting of the Committee held on 9<sup>th</sup> August 2017, the Sites Inspection Panel been invited to undertake an advance Sites Inspection Briefing on 6<sup>th</sup> September 2017 in respect of application 17/02241/FUL.

PL.41 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were no announcements from the Chairman.

PL.42 PUBLIC QUESTIONS

No public questions had been submitted.

PL.43 MEMBER QUESTIONS

No questions had been received from Members.

PL.44 PETITIONS

No petitions had been received.

PL.45 REVISED HACKNEY CARRIAGE AND PRIVATE HIRE LICENSING POLICY

The Committee was requested to consider approving a revised Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Licensing Policy for public consultation.

It was reported that the existing Policy had been revised to ensure that it was up-to-date with current legislation and best practice, and to help improve standards within the licensed taxi trade. Officers amplified various aspects of the circulated report and responded to various questions thereon from Members.

**RESOLVED that:**

**(a) the revised Hackney Carriage and Private Hire licensing policy be approved for public consultation;**

**(b) following public consultation, a further report be submitted to the March 2018 Meeting of this Committee for consideration of approval.**

**Record of Voting - for 15, against 0, abstentions 0, absent 0.**

PL.46 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:-**

**17/02086/FUL**

**Alterations to as-built dwelling, including lowering of existing house, removal of basement, rebuilding of roof and changes to fenestration, reposition of doors to garage (approved as part of 12/04627/FUL) to allow for use as garden store, associated landscape works (part retrospective), at Highview House (formerly Orchard Rise), Charingworth Road, Charingworth, Ebrington, Chipping Campden -**

The Case Officer reminded the Committee of the location of this site and outlined the proposals, drawing attention to the previously-approved dwelling; the 'as built' dwelling; differences between this current application and an application submitted in March 2017 that had been returned by the Council; the context of the site; and proposed alterations to the 'as built' dwelling to achieve compliance with the scheme approved in 2012. The Case Officer also displayed photographs illustrating views of the 'as built' dwelling.

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

The Ward Member, who did not serve on the Committee, was invited to address the Committee and referred to the extensive planning history relating to this site, including an on-going enforcement issue. The Ward Member stated that the Case Officer had sought to guide the Applicant through several applications in relation to this site since 2012, and drew attention to two conditions which the Parish Council had suggested should be attached to any Decision Notice in the event that the Committee was minded to approve this application, as recommended. The Ward Member suggested that, if the Committee was minded to approve this application as recommended, a condition removing Permitted Development Rights in respect of future extensions and enlargements of the basement area should also be attached to any Decision Notice. The Ward Member explained that the property was currently being marketed as a 'B&B' establishment, with bookings being taken well into the next calendar year. The Ward Member referred to concerns expressed within the local community in respect of circumvention of the planning process, and stated that the local community was aware of the Council's position, and the time and expense it had had to expend, in respect of applications on this site. In conclusion, the Ward Member contended that the Committee should consider if this current application would result in the complete resolution of the issues that had been highlighted by the Planning Inspector in June 2016 or if the only way to resolve those issues would be to seek compliance with the 2015 Enforcement Notice which required demolition of the unauthorised building.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that this current application differed from the approved scheme in that it included a basement, relocated chimneys and ashlar stone on the principal elevation; if the Committee was minded to approve this application, the Applicant would be required to adhere to a detailed timetable for the works, which would be monitored by staff in the Council's Enforcement Section; the Enforcement Notice issued previously went with the land and remained in force until its requirements had been satisfied; marketing the property as a 'B&B' establishment did not constitute a Change of Use; if the Committee was minded to approve this application as recommended, a significant reduction in the size of the built development would be achieved through reductions in its overall height and in the size of the side ranges; the Council did not levy a charge for visits by Enforcement Officers; in the opinion of Officers, the use of ashlar stone on a building of the scale now proposed was acceptable in this location; the building, as constructed was not the modest farm worker's cottage which the Applicant had originally sought planning permission for; and, if the Committee was minded to approve this application as recommended, there were a number of remedies available to the Council in the event that the Applicant decided to depart from the approved scheme.

It was considered that the Council's response to the unauthorised works carried out at this site had been endorsed by the Courts and the Planning Inspector, and had achieved a number of positive outcomes. It was further considered that the process would have resulted in the demolition of the unauthorised structure if the Applicant had not taken a 'positive' approach in submitting this current planning application. It was noted that the Council was required by law to adopt a reasonable and proportionate approach in relation to the taking of enforcement action, and to work with the Applicants even though they had resisted throughout the process. In response to concerns over the effectiveness of monitoring development at this site, the Committee was reminded that the proposed timetable would detail when works were to be undertaken.

The Ward Member commented that the criticism by the local community had been levelled at the Applicant's abuse of the planning system and not the Council's handling of the issues.

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

**Approved as recommended.**

**Record of Voting - for 15, against 0, abstentions 0, absent 0.**

Note:

The Committee congratulated Officers for the positive outcomes that had been achieved in respect of development on this site, and commended the Ward Member and local community for their vigilance.

**16/05372/LBC**

**Erection of dining pavilion and hotel accommodation extensions and use of barn as plant room at Hare and Hounds, Fosse Cross, Chedworth -**

This application had been withdrawn following publication of the Schedule of Planning Applications but before the start of the Meeting.

**16/05371/FUL**

**Erection of 28 hotel bedrooms and dining pavilion, creation of car parking and new access and use of barn as plant room at Hare and Hounds, Fosse Cross, Chedworth -**

This application had been withdrawn following publication of the Schedule of Planning Applications but before the start of the Meeting.

**17/02525/FUL**

**Demolition of existing dwelling and construction of replacement dwelling at Inverlea, Back Lane, Mickleton -**

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 displayed photographs illustrating views of the existing building and a virtual Google street view.

It was noted that the proposed replacement dwelling would be of a lower height and span than the existing building, but that the footprint would be larger and that a gable originally proposed would be replaced by a hipped roof.

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

**Approved, as recommended.**

**Record of Voting - for 14, against 0, abstentions 1, absent 0.**

**17/02783/FUL****Erection of Cotswold stone wall to north-west boundary at Hooks Cottage, High Street, Chipping Campden -**

The Case Officer reminded the Committee of the location of this site and displayed a photograph illustrating the trellis which was to be removed. It was reported that the Town Council did not consider 'cock and hen' capping to be appropriate in this location, but the Case Officer explained that another wall at the rear of an adjacent property had 'cock and hen' capping. The wall was within the curtilage of, but not attached to, a Listed Building and it was further reported that the main objection related to land ownership, which was not a material planning consideration in the determination of this application.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that, if the Committee was minded to approve this application, as recommended, the Applicant would still require permission from the landowner before the wall could be erected in the event that the Applicant was not the landowner; Officers were not aware of any alternative solutions which would enable the Applicant's objectives to be achieved; and the proposal was to construct a dry stone wall from natural stone.

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

**Approved, as recommended.**

**Record of Voting - for 14, against 1, abstentions 0, absent 0.**

**17/00255/FUL****Change of use of land to provide a mobile home for an equestrian worker for a period of 3 years at land parcel at Bang Up Lane, Cold Aston -**

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 displayed a virtual Google street view.

The Agent was invited to address the Committee.

The Ward Member, who did not serve on the Committee, was invited to address the Committee and read out comments submitted on behalf of the Parish Council. In making his own comments, the Ward Member contended that this application constituted 'creeping' development which was likely to result in the creation of a permanent dwelling on this site. In conclusion, the Ward Member stated that the views of local residents should be afforded as much regard as possible within the law.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that, in the opinion of Officers, this application accorded with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and would support a local business; if the Committee was minded to approve this application, as recommended, the mobile home could be of a different design as long as it was of the same dimensions; a 'round the clock' presence was generally required on such sites in order to meet equestrian needs; three years was the usual period quoted for such a temporary permission; a new application would have to be submitted if the Applicant wished to retain the mobile home at the end of the temporary permission or build a permanent dwelling; the business plan had set out projections for the period of the temporary permission; the Committee should not afford any weight to the Parish Plan referred to by the Parish Council in its determination of this application; and, in the opinion of Officers, the current use of this site accorded with the previous planning permission granted in 2016.

Some Members expressed concern that approval of this application would eventually result in the submission of an application for a permanent dwelling on this site, and stated that there were examples of substantial stables in other locations without any associated residential accommodation.

Other Members commented that seeking to retain the status quo would frustrate communities as there was a presumption in the NPPF in favour of 'local' businesses. Those Members commented that the site was on the edge of the village, and contended that this was an expanding rural business.

The Ward Member was invited to address the Committee again, and commented that the village had not changed substantially in 120 years and that the local community felt disengaged from the planning process.

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

**Approved, as recommended.**

**Record of Voting - for 11, against 4, abstentions 0, absent 0.**

**17/02488/FUL**

**Change of use from vacant job centre (Class A2) to a gym (Class D2) to be open from 06:00 - 23:00 hours daily; installation of compressors and other external alterations at Forum House, South Way, Cirencester -**

The Team Leader drew attention to the extra representations received since publication of the Schedule of Planning Applications and the Chairman allowed a period of time for the Committee to read those representations that had been circulated at the Meeting. The Team Leader reported an additional representation submitted in support of this application, suggested revisions to the wording of noise conditions following review, and reminded the Committee of the location of this site, drawing attention to its proximity to public car parks and various residential properties and the proposed layout.

An Objector and the Agent were invited to address the Committee.

The Committee Services Manager read out comments received from the Ward Member, who did not serve on the Committee and had been unable to attend the

Meeting. The Ward Member supported the principle of this application, but stated that he shared some of the concerns expressed by residents in relation to highway safety and car parking. The Ward Member welcomed the Applicant's engagement with local residents which had resulted in removal of the proposed twenty-four hour opening element and revised air conditioning units. The Ward Member referred to a parking area at the rear of the building, which had previously been used by employees, thereby limiting vehicle movements to mornings and evenings. The Ward Member urged the Committee to consider restricting the use of this parking area to staff of the facility only in order to maintain the tranquillity of what he considered to be a quiet corner of the busy town centre. The Ward Member commented that it was likely that the proposed gym would be used more frequently before people went to work and in the evenings, when there was likely to be spare capacity in The Forum Car Park. The Ward Member contended that, if this was the case, any restrictions placed on the on-site parking area would not have any adverse impact on parking and could actually encourage people to walk or run to the gym. The Ward Member also expressed concern that increased vehicle movements could have an adverse impact on West Way where the lack of a pavement meant that pedestrians and wheelchair users were already in conflict with cars and vehicles making deliveries to nearby pubs. The Ward Member concluded by suggesting that consideration of this application should be deferred for a Sites Inspection Briefing.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that 'night time' was defined as being between 11.00 p.m. and 7.00 a.m.; if customer expectations from the gym could not be accommodated within the currently proposed hours, the Applicant might seek to amend the recommended condition at some point in the future, which would be considered on its own merits; customers tended to seek the widest access times as possible to such facilities; Officers were not aware of any current gym facilities in the town that were open for 24 hours each day; Gloucestershire Highways had taken account of the established use of the building and had not raised any objections; in the opinion of Officers, the potential number of vehicle movements associated with the proposed use was likely to be low; as this was a comparatively small facility, it was likely that it would only have low-scale employment; the on-site parking facilities would be self-regulating due to the number of parking spaces available; and the Committee was able to determine this application in accordance with its role as the Local Planning Authority, notwithstanding its interest in the Cotswold Leisure Centre.

A number of Members expressed support for this application. Those Members noted the town centre location of the site where, in their opinion, some noise could be expected up to 11.00 p.m. Those Members further considered there to be adequate car parking facilities in the vicinity for both staff and customers, with the indicative useage suggesting that the majority of customers would use the facility at times when there was capacity in The Forum Car Park, and that the established use of the building could result in it being occupied by an enterprise generating more vehicle movements than this proposed use would.

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

Other Members suggested that, if the Committee was minded to approve this application, the opening hours should be restricted to between 7.00 a.m. and 11.00 p.m. on Saturdays and between 8.00 a.m. and 11.00 p.m. on Sundays in order to mitigate any adverse impact from traffic movements connected with the facility on the amenities of local residents, and an Amendment to that effect was



duly Proposed and Seconded. On being put to the vote, that Amendment was LOST. The Record of Voting in respect of that Amendment was - for 3, against 12, abstentions 0, absent 0.

**Approved, as recommended.**

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

**17/02241/FUL**

**Demolition of existing barns and construction of 5 dwellings (2 x 3 bedroom and 3 x 4 bedroom) at Elkstone Farm, Elkstone -**

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 Cirencester and Cheltenham and a public right of way; block and floor plans; treatments and fenestration; and an illustrative extant layout. The Case Officer displayed an aerial photograph of the site, a virtual Google street view, and photographs illustrating views of the site from various vantage points.

An Objector 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. A majority of those Members referred to the empty buildings on the site which, they contended, were starting to look derelict and beginning to decay. One Member expressed the view that this was a sustainable site given its proximity to the highway and some bus routes and that the proposed development would improve the appearance of the site. Some other Members commented that this site was outside the village and expressed the view that the new build element was unsustainable in this location. One Member referred to the extant permission on this site and commented that some of the buildings could be brought back into use in the event that there was an upturn in agriculture in the future.

The Committee Services Manager read out comments received from the Ward Member, who did not serve on the Committee and had been unable to attend the Meeting. The Ward Member stated that he did not think there were any Ward-specific issues arising from this application. He referred to the Officer advice that the fall-back position now carried limited weight, and suggested that following such advice would result in the conversion of two farm buildings to form ten residential dwellings. The Ward Member did not consider that a recent change in the interpretation of policy and assessment of the current application would have any effect on the planning balance, and he commented that those Members who had attended the advance Sites Inspection Briefing would be aware that the barns were mainly empty and had been unused for a considerable period of time, constituting a disappointment when viewed in the landscape. The Ward Member suggested that it could be argued that the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty would benefit more from this current application than it would from the extant permission, and that he would not be concerned if the existing barns were replaced by five dwellings because of the associated landscape benefits. The Ward Member concluded by stating that the Committee would have to weigh such benefits against the potential harm which might be caused to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty by similar applications in other parts of the District.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that, while a sustainable use of this site was supported by policy, neither the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) nor Planning Policy Guidance supported the demolition and replacement of the existing buildings which were typically agricultural in appearance; in determining this application, the Committee should consider the scale of work that would be required to convert the existing barns to provide ten residential units; currently, there were no residential buildings on this site; current policy supported the reuse of the buildings through conversion but not through demolition and rebuilding; the extant permission had proposed smaller buildings than had been proposed under this current application; the extant permission had been granted in order to bring a non-designated heritage asset back into use; the extant permission would result in the majority of the two barns being retained; the Applicant had been requested to provide additional information in respect of flooding and drainage; and, if the Committee was minded to refuse this application, as recommended, an additional refusal reason relating to flooding and drainage issues should be attached to any Decision Notice.

It was suggested that, if the Committee was minded to approve this application, such permission should be subject to receipt of satisfactory flooding and drainage information.

A Member considered that this application should be refused. The Member contended that refusal was clearly supported by the NPPF and that, as the extant permission accorded with conversion requirements, its merits were irrelevant. It was noted that policy required that open market housing should not be considered on this site but that, if such housing was considered, it should result in a betterment over the extant permission which, in the opinion of the Member, it would not. The Member further contended that conversion of the barns would not have any adverse impact on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and that a refusal of this application would allow the extant permission to be developed.

Another Member expressed concern over issues relating to sustainability, light pollution and vehicle movements, and that the extant permission would have more of an adverse impact than this current proposal which, he considered to be a good scheme.

A third Member expressed a preference for the extant scheme which, he considered, would have the appearance of a barn when viewed from a distance.

A Proposition, that this application be refused subject to an additional refusal reason relating to the objection from the local flooding authority, was duly Seconded.

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

**Refused as recommended, subject to an additional refusal reason relating to the objection from the local flooding authority.**

**Record of Voting - for 10, against 5, abstentions 0, absent 0.**

Note:

Subsequent to that decision, but before the close of the Meeting, it was reported that the local flooding authority had confirmed that it had no objections to this

application, subject to appropriate conditions being attached to any Decision Notice. In the circumstances, it was AGREED that the additional refusal reason relating to that objection should be deleted. The Record of Voting in respect of that issue was - for 12, against 1, abstentions 1, absent 1.

### **17/02263/FUL**

#### **Proposed development consisting of two detached four bedroom houses at land adjacent to Little Court, Essex Place, Bourton-on-the-Water -**

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 A429; an adjacent development comprising 100 units; and access. The Case Officer displayed photographs illustrating views of the access and through the site.

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

The Ward Member, who served on the Committee, was invited to address the Committee and expressed his view that a severe, adverse impact would arise from this proposal, because of its proximity to the adjacent residential development, which was contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework. The Ward Member commented that there were no road markings on shared pedestrian/vehicle spaces in the adjacent residential development, and that there had already been an accident there between a pedestrian and a vehicle. The Ward Member stated that residents felt that the developer had not delivered on promises made in relation to that development, and referred to a recent public meeting, which had been attended by fifty residents. The Ward Member further stated that the road leading to this site had not yet been adopted by Gloucestershire Highways, and that this application should not be approved until the outstanding issues on the adjacent development had been addressed. The Ward Member expressed the view that access to this site should be through Essex Place, and concluded by stating that he shared the concerns of residents.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that the proposal was to achieve access to this site through the adjacent development, The Furrows; in the opinion of Officers, this proposal would have minimal impact on The Furrows and there were no enforcement issues there as that development was still under construction; Essex Place was a development comprising six houses on the site of a former riding centre; it would not be possible to access this current site through Essex Place; Little Court was in the same ownership as this current site; if the Committee was minded to approve this application, as recommended, it would not be reasonable to condition that development should only commence once roads in The Furrows had been adopted as there was no guarantee that the relevant section of road would be adopted; and access through Essex Place for construction traffic could be sought if it was reasonable to do so.

A Member commented that the developer had omitted a proposed footpath within The Furrows following publication of the Planning Inspector's report and that this proposal would have an adverse impact on that development. Another Member referred to the level of concern expressed by the Ward Member and the local community, and the potential availability of an alternative access.

In response, the Planning and Development Manager stated that, in its determination of this application, the Committee should consider the site specific circumstances in order to assess the severity of any impact. He referred to the Planning Inspector's conclusions in relation to a recent application for a Care Home at Stow-on-the-Wold, and stated that this current proposal would not have a 'severe' impact.

Other Members expressed the view that there were no substantial reasons to refuse this application. It was noted that this proposal would increase traffic in The Furrows by 2%, and it was considered that, while the issues of shared space in that development was not a relevant consideration in the determination of this application, there were various options available to address those issues. The Members contended that this proposal would not have a severe impact on traffic, and that an alternative access through Essex Place would require a complete redesign of the scheme which could result in an adverse impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties.

A Member referred to on-street parking in Corinium Via, Cirencester and expressed the view that the Committee had a duty to refuse this application, due to the uncertainty relating to the adoption of roads in The Furrows.

A Proposition, that this application be refused for reasons relating to access and highway safety, was duly Seconded.

Note

*That Proposition was subsequently withdrawn by the Proposer following the withdrawal of support for it by Secunder.*

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

A further Proposition, that consideration of this application be deferred, was not Seconded.

**Approved, as recommended.**

**Record of Voting - for 9, against 3, abstentions 3, absent 0.**

Note:

The Chairman commented that this would be the last Meeting of the Committee at which the Case Officer, Mr. J Seymour, would be present as he was due to leave the Council in the next few weeks. On behalf of the Committee, the Chairman wished Mr. Seymour well for the future.

PL.47 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 14, against 1, abstentions 0, absent 0.**

PL.48 SCHEDULE OF APPLICATIONS (CONTINUED)

**RESOLVED that the remaining applications be dealt with in accordance with Minute PL.46 above.**

**17/02671/FUL****Part Retrospective single-storey rear extensions at 4 Railway Terrace, Station Road, Kemble -**

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 mainline railway. The Case Officer displayed photographs illustrating views of the existing building from various vantage points, and views of other buildings in the vicinity.

The Applicant was invited to address the Committee.

The Ward Member, who served on the Committee, was invited to address the Committee and read out comments submitted on behalf of the Parish Council. In making his own comments, the Ward Member stated that this property was one of what he considered to be a pretty row of semi-detached cottages. The Ward Member contended that, while the frontages constituted the main feature of the cottages, the rear elevations were important. The Ward Member explained that most of the cottages had been extended sympathetically, and that such extensions were supported by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). In conclusion, the Ward Member questioned whether this extension should be in line with the original building and if it was appropriate to use render in this location.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that the existing single-storey rear extension had not been built in accordance with the Permitted Development Order; the Committee could refuse this application if there were justifiable reasons for doing so; while the existing rear extension could be reduced in size, it would be difficult to accommodate changes to it; a parapet on a flat roof could be acceptable in a Conservation Area; there was a similar flat roof extension on a neighbouring property; there were limited views of the rear of the building from the nearby community gardens and from the front of the cottages; and the principal building had been constructed using natural stone and reconstructed stone had been used to construct the rear extension.

Some Members considered that, while the proposed extension could be acceptable, the retrospective element was inappropriate in the Conservation Area and appeared unsympathetic to the existing house.

In response to a further question from a Member, it was reported that, if the Committee was minded to refuse this application, the Council could take enforcement action in respect of the retrospective element.

A Proposition, that this application be refused for reasons relating to materials and impact on the existing building and the area, 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 12, abstentions 0, absent 0.

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

**Approved, as recommended.**

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

**17/02598/FUL**

**Insertion of two rooflights to garage at Close Hill, Naunton -**

The Planning and Development Manager explained that Officers had not had sufficient time to consider all the elements referred to in the additional information submitted in respect of this application relating to ecological issues. In the circumstances, it was suggested that, following the presentation by the Case Officer and comments from the public speakers and Ward Member, consideration of this application should be deferred to enable the circulated report to be updated in light of the additional information submitted.

The Case Officer reminded the Committee of the location of this site and outlined the proposals, drawing attention to the floor plan of the approved building and as built. The Case Officer displayed an aerial photograph of the site and photographs illustrating views of the existing building.

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

The Ward Member, who did not serve on the Committee was invited to address the Committee, and commented that the building as constructed did not accord with the approved plan.

A Proposition that this application be deferred, was duly Seconded.

**Deferred for further information.**

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

**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 applications 17/02488/FUL and 17/02241/FUL.

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

Councillor Mrs. SL Jepson was invited to speak on application 17/02086/FUL.

Councillor RJ Keeling was invited to speak on applications 17/00255/FUL and 17/02598/FUL.

(iii) Public Speaking

Public speaking took place as follows:-

<u>17/02086/FUL</u>	)	Councillor H Elson (Parish Council)
	)	Mr. S Ayres (Applicant)
<u>17/00255/FUL</u>	)	Councillor RG Keeling (on behalf of
	)	the Parish Council)
	)	Mr. A Miles (Agent)
<u>17/02488/FUL</u>	)	Mr. D Prewett (Objector speaking on
	)	behalf of Cirencester West Way
	)	Residents' Action Group)
	)	Mr. F Sykes (Agent)
<u>17/02241/FUL</u>	)	Mrs. A Davies (Objector)
	)	Mr. M Chadwick (Agent)
<u>17/02263/FUL</u>	)	Councillor R Daniel (Parish Council)
	)	Mr. RS Campbell (Objector)
	)	Mr. B Frizzell (Agent)
<u>17/02671/FUL</u>	)	Councillor AW Berry (on behalf of the
	)	Parish Council)
	)	Mrs. M Yates (Applicant)
<u>17/02598/FUL</u>	)	Councillor Mrs. B Chance
	)	(Parish Council)
	)	Mr. L Houlden (Objector)

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.49 SITES INSPECTION BRIEFINGS

1. Members for 4<sup>th</sup> October 2017

It was noted that Councillors Sue Coakley, SG Hirst, Juliet Layton and Dilys Neill, together with the Chairman, would represent the Committee at the Sites Inspection Briefing on 4<sup>th</sup> October 2017.

2. Advance Sites Inspection Briefings

It was noted that an advance Sites Inspection Briefing would take place on Wednesday 4<sup>th</sup> October 2017 in respect of the following application:-

17/02224/FUL - Land Parcel north of The Knoll, Whelford Road, Kempsford - erection of 62 dwellings (50% affordable), formation of emergency access, associated landscaping and ancillary works - this was a major application for development on the edge of the village and it would be beneficial for Members to visit the site to assess its relationship with existing dwellings adjacent to the site and to look at the proposed access and the surrounding local highway network.

Note:

This advance Sites Inspection Briefing would be undertaken by the Sites Inspection Briefing Panel.

PL.50 OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business that was urgent.

The Meeting commenced at 9.30 a.m., adjourned between 11.20 a.m. and 11.25 a.m., and again between 1.00 p.m. and 1.20 p.m., and closed at 3.07 p.m.

Chairman

(END)