

**PLANNING AND LICENSING COMMITTEE**

**13<sup>th</sup> December 2017**

**ADDITIONAL PAGES**

---

**ADDITIONAL PAGES - CIRCULATED TO MEMBERS BY POST**

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

Additional Representations on Schedule Items

Pages 1 – 3

**PLANNING AND LICENSING COMMITTEE**

**13<sup>th</sup> December 2017**

**ADDITIONAL PAGES ON SCHEDULE ITEMS**

| <b>Item</b> | <b>Ref. No</b>      | <b>Content</b>  |
|-------------|---------------------|---|
| <b>06</b>   | <b>17/03755/REM</b> | <p><b>Update to planning history –</b></p> <p>55 Down Ampney - 17/04622/CLOPUD Certificate of Lawful Proposed Use or Development under Section 192 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 for the erection of a single storey extension, alteration to the roof and first floor dormer window on the rear elevation of existing dwelling. Issued 29<sup>th</sup> November 2017.</p> <p><b>Further email received -</b></p> <p>Dear Mr. Perks</p> <p>Please see below mail sent to Amey concerning damage to the village green at Down Ampney. The village green is adjacent to the two proposed new houses under consideration and typifies what is likely to happen when the new houses are to be built and subsequently when visitors to same will park either on the grass verge or sufficiently block the road to heavy good vehicles.</p> <p>Ray Jenkins</p> <p>Please note that the village green has been severely damaged by a heavy lorry accessing Church Road. We see this as a prelude to a succession of damage that will be caused during, and after, the construction of the two new properties, and one that is to be refurbished. Can you please attend to repair the green and advise/take action to prevent such damage reoccurring. This is totally unacceptable to the village. Thank you for your kind attention to this matter.</p> <p>Cllr. Ray Jenkins'</p> |
| <b>09</b>   | <b>17/02598/FUL</b> | <p><b>Application Withdrawn.</b></p>  |
| <b>11</b>   | <b>17/03909/FUL</b> | <p><b>Additional Comments from Agent –</b></p> <p>'Dear Committee Members,</p> <p>This is a short statement to clarify some of the queries being raised by the neighbours:</p>  |

|    |              |  |
|----|--------------|--|
|    |              | <p>1. <u>Turning area.</u> To clarify, the turning area in question is in the ownership of the applicant and within the curtilage of The Little House. As the result of an earlier planning condition the owners of Meadowlands and Southfields have the right to turn on it. The turning area would NOT be significantly affected; a dual staffed ambulance is 6.5 m long and an Ocado delivery van is a maximum of 7m. There would still be available 7.3m of turning on the turning area and 11.3 m available if the width of the drive is taken into account, which it is when you are effecting the manoeuvre.</p> <p>2. <u>Pitch of roof and design.</u> The pitch of the roof is to accommodate natural stone tiles, not reconstituted tiles, as this is what is to be found in most of the older parts of the village, and therefore is more in keeping with the conservation area. The use of stone tiles is in line with local planning policy and conservation design guidelines, notwithstanding there is blue slate on the neighboring houses.</p> <p>3. <u>Second floor and WC.</u> To reiterate, there is NO proposal for a second floor, as has been mistakenly stated in some objections. The applicant is considering the use of an ATTIC area as a storage area, accessed by a loft ladder, but this is by no means a second floor. An earlier planning permission at The Little House resulted in the loss of an outside WC when the kitchen was extended, and as a result the applicant is considering the possibility of including one for use by the gardener when the main house is locked/unavailable'.</p> |
| 12 | 17/04194/FUL | <p><b>Letter from the Applicant -</b></p> <p>'Dear Members and all those who are involved in the retention of the outbuilding at 22 Roman Way,</p> <p>Myself and my partner had constructed the outbuilding to let as part of the main house as a holiday let. In the process of purchasing 22 Roman Way we let our solicitors know of our plans. We were strongly advised to check with all concerned parties Cotswold District Council Planning (who seemed fine with the project in its initial sense as long as we followed rules regarding permitted development to which we initially felt we did ). We were then strongly advised to contact Building Control as the outbuilding (pod) was going to be used as a bedroom area. Building Control, who have worked very closely with us from the start, specified we have a foundation dug to a certain depth this is to hold the weight of the pod and to make it safe. Obviously we were very careful as we, and Building Control, hold the safety of those using the pod as a top priority. The foundation depth and the pod being positioned where it is in the garden lead us to fall foul to permitted development rules. The pod has come up six inches too high. This has occurred not due to arrogance of us putting it up without due consideration to those living around us, but because we followed the strict guidelines as laid out</p>  |

by Building Control.

I would also like it noted that we did take due care to consult with the previous owners of the land as there was a restriction about even putting up a shed without permission and they seemed happy with regards to what we were constructing pending we checked first. We also are aware that Moore Lane does back onto an AONB and the field opposite which is owned by The Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust. We consulted with them as we wanted to cut the hedge behind the house so guests could enjoy the view and they have said this is ok as long as we take into consideration issues such as nesting season etc. I myself feel these are the main points raised by the complaints that regard planning. Although other points raised by complaints are very relevant to those who complained they appear to bear no relation to planning and therefore do not feel should in any way stand as a negative to us in our application.

We are happy to work with the Council to resolve matters. Our suggestions are we are happy to put up a fence to the side of the pod to hide its view (no higher than 2metres ) and grow some established roses up it to make it attractive. We would obviously consult with planning before taking this further to check things are done correctly this time. We very much hope our application is approved as it is a mere six inches (20cm) we are talking about. I would also like to ask that if this is objected to on this basis what bearing would this give to every shed or garden building in the Cotswold's area? Please accept we are very sorry for the series of misunderstandings and miscommunication that has led to our out building being brought to this meeting. May I stress again we have tried from the start to conduct things properly and are sorry for any offence caused'.