

COTSWOLD DISTRICT COUNCIL

PLANNING AND LICENSING COMMITTEE

19TH DECEMBER 2017

Present:

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

Councillors -

AW Berry (until 12.05 p.m.)	M Harris
AR Brassington	SG Hirst
Sue Coakley	MGE MacKenzie-Charrington
Alison Coggins	Dilys Neill
RW Dutton	LR Wilkins
David Fowles	

Substitutes:

JA Harris Maggie Heaven

Observers:

RG Keeling (until 12.20 p.m.) Tina Stevenson (until 10.30 a.m.)

Apologies:

SI Andrews PCB Coleman

PL.75 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

(1) Member Declarations

Councillor David Fowles declared an interest in respect of applications 17/04514/NONMAT and 17/04516/NONMAT, because he was acquainted with the Applicant.

Councillor David Fowles declared a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in respect of application 17/03858/FUL, because he was the Applicant, and he left the Meeting while that item was being determined.

Councillor David Fowles declared an interest in respect of application 17/03909/FUL, because he was acquainted with the Objector.

Councillor SG Hirst declared an interest in respect of application 17/01351/REM, because he was acquainted with the Objector.

Councillor Juliet Layton declared an interest in respect of application 17/03909/FUL, because she was acquainted with the Wife of the Objector.

Councillor Lynden Stowe had previously declared an interest in respect of applications 17/04514/NONMAT and 17/04516/NONMAT, because he was related to the Applicant. Councillor Stowe was not present at the Meeting while those items were being determined.

Councillor R Theodoulou had previously declared a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in respect of application 17/03909/FUL, because he owned some land in the vicinity of the site. Councillor Theodoulou was not present at the Meeting while that item was being considered.

(2) Officer Declarations

There were no declarations of interest from Officers.

PL.76 SUBSTITUTION ARRANGEMENTS

Councillor JA Harris substituted for Councillor PCB Coleman.

Councillor Maggie Heaven substituted for Councillor SI Andrews.

PL.77 MINUTES

RESOLVED that:

(a) the Minutes of the Meeting of the Committee held on 8th November 2017 be approved as a correct record;

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

(b) the Minutes of the Special Meeting of the Committee held on 23rd November 2017 be approved as a correct record.

Record of Voting - for 9, against 0, abstentions 6, absent 0.

PL.78 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were no announcements from the Chairman.

PL.79 PUBLIC QUESTIONS

No public questions had been submitted.

PL.80 MEMBER QUESTIONS

No questions had been received from Members.

PL.81 PETITIONS

No petitions had been received.

PL.82 SCHEME OF DELEGATION

The Committee considered a report detailing a suggested amendment to its current Scheme of Delegation in respect of minor applications, notifications and

consultations falling within Class D of the current Scheme of Delegation. In that regard, the Committee was requested to consider the delegation of applications for non-material changes; compliance with conditions; Certificates of Lawfulness of Proposed Use; and Environmental Impact Assessment Screening and Scoping Opinions submitted:-

- (i) by or on behalf of the Council;
- (ii) on land owned by the Council;
- (iii) on land in which the Council has an interest;
- (iv) by or on behalf of, or on land owned by, a serving Member of the Council;
- (v) by or on behalf of, or on land owned by, the partner, close relative or close relative of the partner, of a serving Member of the Council.

It was reported that the Council received approximately 1,000 requests for non-material changes each year, most of which did not need to be referred to the Committee for determination.

It was further reported that, subject to the Committee's approval of the suggested revisions, the text in the Scheme of Delegation relating to Class D applications would require amendment to ensure consistency with the approved Scheme, including deletion of the requirement to consult the Chairman of the Committee and the relevant Ward Member(s).

RESOLVED that the revised Scheme of Delegation relating to the Planning and Licensing Committee be approved and adopted.

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

PL.83 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:-

17/01351/REM**Reserved Matters Application in conjunction with Outline Planning Permission reference 14/00176/OUT for the erection of up to 39 dwellings and associated works at Land Parcel to the South of Berrells Road and to the West of Bath Road, Tetbury -**

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 existing residential properties; emerging Local Plan policies; the interface distances between the proposed development and existing residential properties; an indicative layout, which had been approved on appeal at the outline application stage, and as amended; boundary treatments; elevations; cross sections; house types; materials; and finishes.

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. Those Members commented that this was a prominent site on the gateway to the town when approached from the south-west, and that the existing bungalows to the west of the site were at a significantly lower level. One Member expressed the view that any development on this site should not appear 'oppressive' in the context of the bungalows, and another expressed the view that the proposed interface distances were acceptable.

The Ward Member, who did not serve on the Committee, was invited to address the Committee and expressed concern over issues relating to the affordability of the proposed development. The Ward Member reminded the Committee that this site was in close proximity to the town, and expressed concern over pedestrian safety because of the narrowness of some of the footpaths, where they existed. The Ward Member commented that the town was not brimming with local facilities, and that public transport services had been cut significantly. The Ward Member expressed her view that the proposed development was still flawed at this stage, and that any significant adverse impact on the living conditions of neighbouring residents could constitute a reason to refuse this application. The Ward Member drew attention to the attenuation pond, which was proposed for location within the public open space, and expressed concern that the pond would not be fenced off. In conclusion, the Ward Member commented that some neighbouring residents still had concerns over the potential impact the proposed development could have on their properties.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that the appeal decision had established the principle of development on this site; a subsequent application to vary a condition had been approved in June 2014, and this current application had been submitted in June 2017, prior to the date the outline permission was due to expire; at the appeal, the Planning Inspector had stated clearly that a 4 metre buffer on the southern boundary was necessary for this development to be acceptable in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB); a further 2 metre strip was required to enable maintenance of that buffer to be carried out; a minimum interface distance of 21 metres had been considered acceptable by the Planning Inspector but, in response to objections received, the Applicant had achieved a distance of 22 metres in respect of all but one dwelling,

where a distance of 21.5 metres had been achieved; the affordable housing units would be spread across the site and would be constructed using natural stone, render and reconstructed stone; the Committee should be mindful of the Emerging Local Plan in its determination of this application but 'significant' weight could not yet be attached to that Plan and retrospective conditions could not be imposed on this development; in the opinion of Officers, the proposed interface distances and light impact standards were considered to be acceptable; the developer intended to bury the existing power cables crossing the site; the attenuation pond would have the appearance of a grassed area sloping down to a soakaway; in the opinion of Officers, fencing the attenuation pond would create a restricted area which people could be attracted to enter, and would make it difficult to see if anyone was in the pond; access paths were proposed to enable pedestrian access to the rear of the terraced units; and, in the opinion of Officers, the arrangements in relation to sewage were acceptable.

A Member commented that the attenuation pond should be fenced as public safety was more important than visual appearance. In response, it was reported that current advice was that not fencing off attenuation ponds made it safer to manage them and that fencing could encourage people to climb over to gain access to the restricted area. It was considered that an adequate interface distance had been achieved between the proposed development and existing houses, which should not suffer any loss of light or privacy, and that a 4 metre buffer with a 2 metre maintenance strip, was necessary in this AONB location. A Proposition, that this application be approved subject to no adverse comments being received from the Highway Officer, was duly Seconded.

In response to a further comment from the Ward Member, it was reported that the provision of water butts had been included in the submitted drainage plan.

Approved, subject to no adverse comments being received from the Highway Officer.

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

17/03352/FUL

Removal of Conditions 1 (temporary use and occupancy) and 3 (restoration of site) of planning permission 15/04432/FUL to allow permanent retention of the site at Land Parcel opposite Windmill Farm, Hartley Lane, Leckhampton Hill, Coberley -

The Planning and Development Manager reminded the Committee of the location of this site and outlined the proposals, drawing attention to Counsel's advice relating to the interests of children, and the layout of the site. The Planning and Development Manager displayed an aerial photograph of the site, and photographs illustrating views of, and into, the site from various vantage points.

A representative of the Parish Council and the Agent were invited to address the Committee.

The Committee Services Manager read out comments submitted by the Ward Member, who did not serve on the Committee and had been unable to attend the Meeting. The Ward Member disagreed that the additional representations made by the Agent and a Supporter materially assisted the Applicant's case. The Ward Member referred to the Officer recommendation on 8th November 2017 that this

application be refused for the reasons stated at that time, and contended that Counsel's advice on the Human Rights issues raised in that report had clarified that refusal was proportionate and lawful. The Ward Member referred to the responses given at the Local Plan Examination on the provision of sites for Gypsies and Travellers by the author of the 'Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment' (GTAA) to the suggestions made by the Applicant and his Agent regarding the methodology used, which they considered to have been cursory and unsound. The Ward Member contended that the author had clearly demonstrated the GTAA to be detailed, accurate and sound. The Ward Member referred to the uncertainty expressed in relation to the current occupation of the site, and the issue of the occupants meeting the definition set out in the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites and, in conclusion, expressed support for the granting of a further one-year temporary permission to allow time for clarification of those issues.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that the definition of 'Gypsies and travellers' had been set out on pages 58 and 59 of the circulated report; there was some uncertainty as to whether some of the occupants of this site met that definition; a further temporary permission would allow time for the issues raised at the Local Plan Examination to be addressed; the Council had a duty to meet the identified need for Gypsy and traveller sites; the Committee should consider need and personal circumstances in its determination of this application; a pitch could accommodate a mobile home and a caravan or two mobile homes; and the length of time required to hear an appeal against refusal of an application depended on a number of factors, including the type of appeal.

A Member expressed the view that it was not desirable to have a Gypsy and traveller site situated next to the Cotswold Way.

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

Approved, for a temporary period of one year.

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

Note:

This permission relates to the use of this site and not the occupancy.

17/03441/FUL

The use of land for the stationing of caravans for residential purposes for 1 no. Gypsy pitch together with the formation of additional hard standing and utility/dayrooms ancillary to that use; formation of a dayroom for an existing Gypsy pitch at Hillside View, Hartley Lane, Seven Springs -

The Planning and Development Manager reminded the Committee of the location of this site and outlined the proposals, drawing attention to the layout of the site.

A representative of the Parish Council and the Agent were invited to address the Committee.

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

Meeting. The Ward Member expressed support for the Officer recommendation to refuse this application, for the three reasons stated.

In response to a question from a Member, it was reported that if the Committee was minded to refuse this application as recommended, the Applicant could decide to submit a further application in the future.

A Member commented that, currently, there was too much uncertainty around this application and a Proposition, that it be refused as recommended, was duly Seconded.

Refused, as recommended.

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

17/03659/FUL

Re-roofing in imitation stone tiles (and new insulated ceiling finished below rafters) at Sapperton Village Hall, Sapperton -

The Senior Conservation and Design Officer (the Officer) reminded the Committee of the location of this site and outlined the proposals, drawing attention to its location within a Conservation Area and the traditional Arts and Crafts detailing. The Officer displayed photographs illustrating views of the building from various vantage points, and a virtual Google street view, and explained that the building was a valued community facility.

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

The Committee Services Manager read out comments submitted by the Ward Member, who did not serve on the Committee, and had been unable to attend the Meeting. The Ward Member commended Officers for their work in progressing this application, with a view to reaching an acceptable compromise, including the provision of advice on financial support. The Ward Member stated that the Trustees had concluded that their legal duty to maintain the asset outweighed the Listed Building considerations. The Ward Member contended that a watertight roof, achieved at an affordable cost, would enable the Trustees to provide an amenity intended for their Charity beneficiaries. The Ward Member further contended that, if the Trustees were obliged to re-roof the building in natural Cotswold stone, it was unlikely that they would be able to raise the necessary funding which could result in them having to work with the Charity Commission to find an alternative way forward. The Ward Member commented that one such alternative way could involve sale of the building with the proceeds being invested to provide a modern, purpose-built hall elsewhere in the village. The Ward Member expressed the view that, while that might be a better option for the building itself, it would be a poor result for the local community. The Ward Member stated that, on this occasion, the planning balance should be struck in favour of the community, and he concluded by suggesting that the Committee should consider permitting this application.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that the local Church of England Primary School used the building; it was considered to be a valuable community asset and an important community facility; in the opinion of Officers, the use of artificial tiles in this location would represent a palpable, visual

change as such tiles did not replicate the weathering patterns of natural stone; the building was considered to be of national importance because of its significant architectural and historical interest; no objections to this proposal had been received from consultees; the Trustees had made approaches to various funding bodies but still faced a shortfall of £26,000 in respect of the compromise suggested by Officers but had sufficient funding to re-roof the building using artificial tiles; in the opinion of Officers, any change to artificial tiles would have an immediate impact and it was unlikely that the natural stone roof would be restored in the future; the suggested compromise would be tantamount to a refusal of this current application; the roof of the building was in need of attention and had been for a number of years; and it was likely that most of the original natural stone tiles were original as such tiles had extended longevity.

Some Members considered that this application should be approved because, they considered, the community benefit that would accrue would outweigh any harm. The Members considered this current proposal to be the final option available to the Trustees to ensure that the roof was repaired. One Member commented that consideration should be given to the social benefits that would accrue from this proposal, as well as the environmental and economic benefits.

A Proposition, that this application be approved subject to conditions to be specified by the Officer, was duly Seconded.

Other Members considered that this application should be refused, as recommended. Those Members contended that reconstructed tiles would not last as long, nor weather as well as natural stone tiles, and that refusal would allow time for the Trustees to investigate other funding options to be explored, which could allow the compromise solution suggested by the Officer to be implemented as soon as possible.

Another Proposition, that this application be refused as recommended, was duly Seconded.

Some other Members suggested that consideration of this application be deferred to enable the Trustees to explore alternative funding options.

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

On being put to the vote, the first Proposition, that this application be approved subject to conditions to be specified by the Officer, was CARRIED.

Approved, subject to conditions to be specified by the Senior Conservation and Design Officer.

Record of Voting - for 7, against 6, abstentions 1, absent 1.

Notes:

This decision was contrary to the Officer recommendation because a majority of the Committee considered that, notwithstanding the presence of an heritage asset and the level of harm that would be caused, the proposal would secure the future of the building and its community use. In reaching its decision, a majority of the Committee was satisfied that the funding sources had been satisfied.

The conditions would include a requirement to replicate traditional features of the building which, in the opinion of Officers, was of national importance because of its Arts and Crafts design.

16/05190/FUL

Proposed single-storey 2 bedroomed dwelling at Roof Trees, Rissington Road, 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 a number of protected trees to the east; the suggested root protection areas; the design of the proposed building; access; and visibility. The Case Officer displayed an aerial photograph of the site, photographs illustrating views into the site and of the boundary treatments and access, and a virtual Google street view.

The Ward Member, who did not serve on the Committee, was invited to address the Committee and stated that he supported the views expressed by the Parish Council and Objectors. The Ward Member contended that access to this site should be from The Gorse as, in his opinion, the proposed access would effectively create a crossroads as it was opposite an existing road. The Ward Member explained that the current speed limit along Rissington Road was 30 mph, but he contended that it was a busy road and that traffic tended to travel at speeds in excess of 30 mph. In conclusion, the Ward Member stated that this application had gone through several iterations, which had reduced the impact of the proposed development, but that the Parish Council had been consistent in its objections.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that the access, which was intended to serve a single two-bedroomed dwelling, accorded with current visibility requirements; and that the creation of an access to this site from The Gorse would have an adverse impact on the protected trees.

A Member commented that the local Speed Watch team regularly recorded between 20 and 30 vehicles per hour speeding along Rissington Road. The Member considered the proposed access point to be dangerous and suggested that this application should be refused.

Another Member reminded the Committee that the access was intended to serve a single two-bedroomed dwelling.

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

Approved, as recommended.

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

17/03755/REM**Reserved Matters application for erection of 2 dwellings with detached garages and associated infrastructure at land adjacent to 55 Down Ampney**

-

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 a Certificate of Lawfulness issued in relation to the adjacent property at 55 Down Ampney; the proximity of the site to a public right of way; access; and the proposed layout. The Case Officer displayed photographs illustrating views of, and into, the site from various vantage points, a protected Yew Tree, and a virtual Google street view.

A Member of the Parish Council, two Objectors and the Agent were invited to address the Committee.

The Ward Member, who served on the Committee, was invited to address the Committee. The Ward Member explained that, having made comments in his capacity as Ward Member, he would take no part in the determination of this application because he had a pre-determined view and supported the views expressed by the Parish Council and the Objectors.

The Ward Member amplified the reasons why he had referred this application to the Committee for determination, and stated that these properties would be the first buildings visible to people approaching the village from the west. The Ward Member considered Down Ampney to be a working village and contended that this sensitive site was in the most stunning part of the village, given its close proximity to the Grade II Listed Cross and Grade I Listed Church. The Ward Member suggested that any development on this site should be of a good design and should not have an overbearing nature. The Ward Member referred to various policies relating to the preservation of Listed Buildings and stated that developments should not have any adverse impact on such buildings. The Ward Member also referred to the Down Ampney Village Design Statement, and expressed his view that this proposal had not taken account of any of the elements in that Statement, and that there were still a number of outstanding issues to be resolved. The Ward Member suggested that any buildings should be set back within this site to match the existing adjacent building; the proposed roof lights in the front elevation were not in keeping with existing development; and that the front doors should be set back at the rear of the porches, with the side windows in the porches being deleted. The Ward Member also suggested that any development should provide off-street parking to the rear and should seek to improve the landscaping to the front. In conclusion, the Ward Member suggested that this application should be refused so that an application which addressed all of the policy issues could be submitted.

In response to various questions, it was reported that the impact on the setting of Listed Buildings carried significant weight in the determination of planning applications, and had been taken into account in the assessment of this application; the proposed development was of the same style, scale and layout, and in the same position, as had been proposed at the outline planning application stage; in the opinion of Officers, it accorded with the Design Statement; there were a number of other properties in the vicinity of this site which

had installed doors to the front of their porches; the existing parking spaces for 54 and 55 Down Ampney would be retained, and parking spaces would be provided for these properties; and the proposed units would be constructed using natural stone.

A Member expressed the view that this development could, potentially, enhance the appearance of the village when approached from the west, the design was in keeping with the rest of the village, and the proposed roof lights would not cause any demonstrable harm.

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

Approved, as recommended.

Record of Voting - for 13, against 0, abstentions 0, absent 1, did not vote 1.

17/04514/NONMAT

Erection of a bungalow (non-material amendment to permission 16/02323/FUL involving raising of ridgeline by 225mm and addition of 3 rooflights in north elevation) at land adjacent to Harbourlow, Broadway Road, Mickleton -

The Case Officer reminded the Committee of the location of this site and outlined the proposals, drawing attention to the amended roof line and fenestration.

In response to a question from a Member, it was reported that the roof line would be raised by 120 mm, and that the nature of the accommodation would not be changed.

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

Approved, as recommended.

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

17/04516/NONMAT

Erection of a bungalow (non-material amendment to permission 16/02322/FUL involving raising of ridgeline by 225mm and addition of 3 rooflights in north elevation and alterations to fenestration) at land adjacent to Harbourlow, Broadway Road, Mickleton, Chipping Campden -

The Case Officer reminded the Committee of the location of this site and outlined the proposals, drawing attention to the amended roof line and fenestration.

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

Approved, as recommended.

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

17/02598/FUL**Retrospective erection of a replacement garage with two additional rooflights (re-submission of 16/01577/FUL at Close Hill, Naunton -**

This application had been withdrawn following publication of the Schedule of Planning Applications and prior to the date of this Meeting.

17/03858/FUL**Proposed extensions to side and rear and new porch at Nurses House, London Road, Poulton -**

The Case Officer reminded the Committee of the location of this site and outlined the proposals, drawing attention to the five elements of the application; a block plan; layout; and existing and proposed floor plans, elevations and fenestration. The Case Officer displayed photographs illustrating views of the existing building and into the site.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that the rear extensions had been set back 150 mm from the boundary following an objection from a neighbour; no representations had been received from the Parish Council; and no alterations were proposed to the existing access.

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.

17/03909/FUL**Proposed garage and garden machinery store at The Little House, Victoria Road, Quenington -**

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 extent of the Applicant's land ownership; access; elevations; the relationship between the proposed garage and the neighbouring properties; and a protected turning area. The Case Officer displayed photographs of the site illustrating views of the access and into the site.

An Objector was invited to address the Committee.

The Committee Services Manager read out a comment submitted by the Ward Member, who did not serve on the Committee and was not present at the Meeting having previously declared a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest. The Ward Member suggested that it might be appropriate to defer determination of this application for a Sites Inspection Briefing.

In response to a question from a Member, it was reported that no alternative locations or designs had been put forward by the Applicant.

A Proposition, that consideration of this application be deferred for a Sites Inspection Briefing, was duly Seconded.

Deferred for a Sites Inspection Briefing to assess the impact on the area and neighbouring properties.

Record of Voting - for 8, against 6, abstentions 0, absent 1.

Note:

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

17/04194/FUL

Retention of outbuilding at 22 Roman Way, 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, including its proximity to a Scheduled Ancient Monument, and outlined the proposals, drawing attention to the access and materials. The Case Officer displayed photographs illustrating views of the building from various vantage points and from within the site.

The Ward Member, who served on the Committee, was invited to address the Committee and amplified the reasons why he had referred this application to the Committee for determination. The Ward Member contended that this development was inappropriate in this location given the potential for disturbance to be caused when the building was used to provide holiday accommodation as it was let in association with the main house and there was no resident caretaker. In conclusion, the Ward Member expressed his opinion that the development was out of character with the area, highly visible within the site, and too close to the boundary with an adjacent property.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that Officers were not aware of any noise complaints arising from this development, other than through third party comments submitted in relation to this application; the structure constituted an outbuilding; and its use was ancillary to that of the main house.

The Ward Member commented that the building had been constructed recently. Another Member expressed support for this application.

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

Approved, as recommended.

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

Notes:

(i) Additional Representations

A list setting out details of additional representations received since the Schedule of Planning Applications had been prepared was considered in conjunction with the related planning applications.

Additional representations were reported at the Meeting in respect of applications 17/03755/REM and 17/03909/FUL.

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

Councillor RG Keeling was invited to speak on application 16/05190/FUL.

Councillor Tina Stevenson was invited to speak on application 17/01351/REM.

(iii) Public Speaking

Public speaking took place as follows:-

<u>17/01351/REM</u>)	Mr. N Cook (Objector)
)	Mr. A Trower (Agent)
<u>17/03352/FUL</u>)	Mr. M Campbell (on behalf of the
)	Parish Council)
)	Mr. M Hargreaves (Agent)
<u>17/03441/FUL</u>)	Mr. M Campbell (on behalf of the
)	Parish Council)
)	Mr. N Green (Agent)
<u>17/03659/LBC</u>)	Councillor Mrs. SL Osborn-Smith
)	(Parish Council)
)	Mr. JS Bullock (Applicant)
<u>17/03755/REM</u>)	Councillor G Tappern (Parish Council)
)	Mr. R Jenkins and Mrs. S Ashhurst
)	(Objectors)*
)	Mr. D Lloyd Jones (Agent)
<u>17/3909/FUL</u>)	Mr. D Mallinson (Objector)

* - this speaking slot was shared

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.84 SITES INSPECTION BRIEFINGS

1. Members for 3rd January 2018

It was noted that Councillors AR Brassington, PCB Coleman, Juliet Layton and LR Wilkins, together with the Chairman, would represent the Committee at the Sites Inspection Briefing on Wednesday 3rd January 2018.

2. Advance Sites Inspection Briefings

No advance Sites Inspection Briefings had been notified.

The Meeting commenced at 9.30 a.m., adjourned between 10.55 a.m. and 11.05 a.m., and again between 12.55 p.m. and 1.10 p.m., and closed at 1.35 p.m.

Chairman

(END)