

**PLANNING AND LICENSING COMMITTEE**

**9<sup>th</sup> May 2018**

**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 - 9

**PLANNING AND LICENSING COMMITTEE**

**9<sup>th</sup> May 2018**

---

**ADDITIONAL PAGES ON SCHEDULE ITEMS**

---

**Item Ref. No Content**

---

<b>01</b>	<b>17/03826/REM</b>	<b>Minutes of a meeting between the Applicant, Agent, Ward Member and Members of the Parish Council – Please see attached.</b>  <b>Email from Agent – Please see attached dated 3<sup>rd</sup> May 2018.</b>
<b>02</b>	<b>18/00526/FUL</b>	<b>Further information from Applicant - Perspective image – Please see attached.</b>

**Minutes of meeting held at CDC offices on Thursday 26<sup>th</sup> April to discuss the Broadway Farm Planning Application (17/03826/REM in Down Ampney.**

**Present:- Jonathan Mullins – Head of Development (Land) Sanctuary Group.**

**Mike Jones – Managing Director IDP Planning.**

**David Fowles – Cotswold District Councillor.**

**Ray Jenkins – Down Ampney Parish Council Chairman.**

**Julia Job – Down Ampney Parish Council.**

**Geoff Tappern – Down Ampney Parish Council.**

This meeting was requested by Sanctuary to up-date on progress since the CDC Planning Committee hearing on April 11<sup>th</sup> 2018 and to discuss outstanding issues. An agenda was agreed and covered the following topics.

**1). Appeal:-**

Sanctuary stated that they will appeal the application as it stands on the grounds of non-determination. But they were very keen to try and clarify, update, and to look to resolve outstanding issues which, if agreed, could result in the re-submission of the application.

**2). Sewerage:-**

Sanctuary are well aware of the limitations of the existing sewerage system and the concerns of the village. The history of the letter from Thames Water dated 7<sup>th</sup> Dec 2017 was discussed. Thames Water cannot refuse the connection from the 44 houses as the principle of development has been established by the outline permission. Thames Water will be carrying out a "capacity study" and will then come forward with a proposal. This study is expected to be completed in a number of weeks, Sanctuary will advise the expected timeframe when Thames confirm. Sanctuary will make available to the Parish Council correspondence received from Thames Water.

**3). Surface Water.**

Sanctuary are well aware of the concerns of the village regarding flooding. They have seen the many photos of field and road flooding submitted by residents. When designing the surface water layout the design parameter is taken as a green field run off (which is the position the Environment Agency require developers to adopt). With the system of swales, attenuation areas and underground tanks Sanctuary's engineers confirm that their solution will control surface water run-off in a controlled manner and attenuated within the site and not allowed to run-off uncontrolled as is the present situation. Camera surveys have been carried out of the Highways drains in the Down Ampney Road and the results have been given to the Highway Authority and to the LLFA. There will be a meeting between the Highway Authority and the Lead Local Flood Authority in the next two weeks to clarify routing and capacity once the surface water is off site. A representative of the Parish Council (PC) or the Ward member will be invited to this meeting as an observer subject to the agreement of the LLFA and Highways. There were concerns raised by the Parish Council representatives that the land height and gradient after the archaeological survey was not the same as before resulting in extensive site flooding. Sanctuary confirmed that when they survey the site for "build" they will take the planning permission levels and therefore gradient. Sanctuary will consider and discuss with CDC Planning the request from the PC for a 1.2 metre fence around the swale next to the permissive path.

**4). Site layout/buffer zone.**

The latest drawing of the site layout is P001 Rev D. The PC again requested that the layout of the site to be revisited moving the six houses from the northern boundary and redistributing to other areas of the development to keep a green "buffer zone" all around the development. It is a large site and the PC believe there

2

Item 01

17/03826/REM

is sufficient available space to do this. Sanctuary pointed out that in "pre-application meetings" with CDC planning, landscape and urban design officers, the site layout was discussed and the officers found the layout as reported to committee to be satisfactory. The PC stated that the views of the residents must also be taken into account. Sanctuary stated that there were many site constraints particularly from drainage swales and tanks but also from the CDC landscape and urban design officers. Sanctuary have agreed to discuss the matter further with their architects and will look at possible options providing they do not affect the commercial viability of the scheme.

#### **5). Access to site.**

The PC stated its concerns over the position of the access from the Down Ampney Road and requested that it be moved further away from the existing Co-op houses. This would improve sight lines. Sanctuary stated moving the access position was no longer an option as the access had been determined under the outline permission and a reserved matters application cannot change it. But they had an agreement with the Co-op to rebuild the existing front garden wall to the houses to improve the sight lines, and that the Highway Authority had approved a safety audit on this basis.

#### **6). Footpaths and speed humps.**

The PC stated its safety concerns over the shared roads and paths proposed particularly as it was an all tarmac surface. There will be many young children on this development and there are safety concerns. Sanctuary stated that shared space is a design that is endorsed by Gloucestershire County Council and its use has been adopted in many schemes in the Cotswolds. The problems with the Cirencester market place area was discussed. Sanctuary would consider and discuss with CDC Planning a possible difference in colour or material to designate which is "path" and which is "road". Speed humps are not required by the Highway Authority.

#### **7). Construction materials.**

Material Distribution Drawing MD001 Rev D shows construction materials for each house. The PC have requested to change all brick construction to either natural stone or recon stone. This also applies to chimneys. Also, to change all plain tiles (means red) to either artificial stone or natural slate. Sanctuary are prepared to agree to this and will discuss with CDC Planning.

#### **8). Affordable houses.**

The PC requested that the number of affordable houses should be reduced. The village is way in excess of its requirement from CDC. Sanctuary pointed out that 50% was a requirement of the Unilateral Undertaking accepted by the Planning Inspector in the Appeal decision and would be difficult to change. Sanctuary were not against reducing the figure but required discussions with CDC Planning on how to do this and whether CDC would agree to any changes to the provision of affordable housing.

#### **9). Reserved Matters & Compliance:-**

The concerns of the Parish Council and the CDC Planning Committee was that sewerage water and surface water should be considered at the same time as the layout. Sanctuary stated that sewerage and surface water had to be considered under a Compliance Application as they are both Conditions of the Appeal decision. But that they were not against these being heard by CDC Planning Committee at the same time.

#### **10). Future meetings:-**

All present felt that the meeting was worthwhile and a future meeting will be held in approx. three to four weeks when progress on the above topics can be discussed.

Geoff Tappern. DAPC. 28<sup>th</sup> April 2018.

3

Ham 01  
17/03/2018/REM.

## Claire Baker

---

**From:** Mike Jones  
**Sent:** 03 May 2018 11:57  
**To:** Claire Baker  
**Cc:** Sophie Bell; Jonathan Mullins; David Fowles;  
**Subject:** RE: 17/03826/REM Land At Broadway Farm, Down Ampney

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Dear Claire,

Further to our telephone conversations of earlier today, I can confirm that an appeal against non-determination of the REM application will be submitted to the Planning Inspectorate very shortly, once the necessary documents have been finalised.

As you know, a meeting took place at the CDC offices on 26<sup>th</sup> April attended by Cllr David Fowles, several members of the Parish Council and Jonathan Mullins of Sanctuary and myself. This was an extremely constructive meeting, the minutes of which have been circulated with a view to progressing the discussions once Sanctuary has had time to consider the points raised at the meeting. In addition, a meeting with the LLFA and Highway Authority has been arranged for 9<sup>th</sup> May to discuss surface water drainage and both the Chair of the Parish Council and Cllr Fowles have been invited as observers.

Whilst Sanctuary has reluctantly decided that they have to appeal the current application, should discussions with Cllr Fowles and the Parish Council result in a decision to resubmit a REM application, this can be progressed notwithstanding that the appeal process will continue in the timescale set out by the Planning Inspectorate.

I trust that this clarifies the matter but please do not hesitate to contact me if you wish to discuss anything before the Committee meeting.

Regards

**MIKE JONES**  
MRTPi  
MANAGING DIRECTOR IDP  
PLANNING  
M: 07738 427205  
mjones@idpgroup.com



**IDP**  
27 SPON STREET  
COVENTRY CV1 3BA

T: +44 (0)24 7652 7600  
F: +44 (0)24 7652 0424

ARCHITECTS  
URBAN DESIGNERS  
PLANNERS  
PROJECT MANAGERS  
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS  
WE ARE IDP



**Planning Application 18/00526FUL 9<sup>th</sup> May 2018 Committee Meeting**

**Hunters Lodge, 25 Ampney Crucis, Gloucestershire, GL7 5SA**

**Description of the Proposals & REBUTTAL to Ampney Parish Council Comments**

**A - Our history in the Cotswolds and Our Commitment to Design Quality**

My family has lived in the Cotswold District for three hundred years and have lived in Ampney Crucis for over 100 years and therefore we are very committed to creating a home of the highest quality design, attention to detail and materiality.

I am fully trained in planning and design and in my 30-year career I have received numerous planning and design awards including, a Civic Trust Award, World Architecture Planning Award, and Landscape Institute Awards for my design sensitivity and care for the environment. I have also acted as a CABI Enabler. Some of my designs have been complemented separately by Prince Charles and The Duke of Edinburgh.

**So, I trust you can imagine we are committed to Conserving and Enhancing the Conservation Area of Ampney Crucis and the environment as a whole.**

**B - Planning Precedents in Ampney Crucis**

Our Design Statement catalogues a whole series of extensions in Ampney Crucis Conservation Area to the front, side and rear with particular reference to our next-door neighbour 24 Ampney Crucis who has carried out significant extensions to the front, side and rear of what was a similar size and age of our house.

**C - Our Proposals and Planning Policy/Design Code Compliance**

We note that our house is not listed, and we note that it is a heritage asset providing by way of its front, southern elevation a positive contribution to the Conservation Area. However, the pebble dashed rear elevation and poor quality lean-to conservatory, together with several barns, sheds and greenhouse cause a negative impact on the Conservation Area. Our proposal is to preserve the positive elements of the property and remove the negative elements and replace it with a sensitively designed extension and thus creating a significant enhancement to the Ampney Crucis Conservation Area.

At the request of the Officers we have carried out a series of amendments and a reduction to the building mass.

Both the Planning Officer and Conservation Officer of Cotswold District Council have recommended this application for approval and indeed can be quoted as saying **"it is considered that the amended design, form, proportions and use of materials would respect the character and appearance of the application site and the Conservation Area. The proposed works are considered to accord with the objectives of Cotswold District Local Plan Policies 15, 42, and the design considerations contained in and guidance of the NPPF"**

5

Item 02.  
18/00526/FUL

We are committed to an environmentally sustainable house extension. Particular care and attention has been placed on high quality design, locally sourced materials, local employment and energy saving insulation.

Special care and attention has been taken to ensure the proposal is in full compliance with the **Cotswold Design Code** as follows:

**Style**- the design is in strict accordance with the Cotswold Vernacular.

**Setting**- the careful design and use of materials enhances the setting of the Conservation Area. - The extension is at the rear and not visible from the road.

**Harmony**- The design and quality of detailing ensures that the proposals are in harmony with the heritage assets in the immediate context.

**Street Scene**- by replacing and reintroducing the front elevation window together using high quality conservation windows significantly enhances the street scene in this part of Ampney Crucis

**Proportion**- the height and eaves lines match the existing 1.5 storey house/use of a 50-degree roof pitch as requested at the Pre- Application stage and is therefore in proportion with the existing house.

**Simplicity**- the design proposed is simple and elegant in its form, detailing and appearance.

**Materials**- we are dedicated to the use of high quality materials as required by the Design Code.

**Craftsmanship**- the use of Cotswold stone facades, Roof slates, Timber Windows and dry-stone walls will celebrate the local craftsmanship and boost the local economy. This careful attention to design quality is all in compliance with the Cotswold Design Code.

## **D – Neighbour Support**

None of our neighbours have objected to the proposals and in fact our application has received three letters of support from my immediate neighbours as the design significantly enhances the aesthetics and appearance of the house and their environment and views. The proposals remove unsightly pebble dashed kitchen and bathroom and an unsightly lean-to substandard conservatory, together with the removal of a whole series of barns and sheds amounting to a net reduction of 28m<sup>3</sup> of built form in the Conservation Area. As the extension is at the rear it is NOT seen from the road or other properties and therefore does not over power the existing house.

## **E - Parish Councils Comments and Replies**

The Parish Councils comments were based on the original application which has been subsequently reduced in scale and has now been approved by the Planning Officer and Conservation Officer. I will respond to each point in turn.

1. Roof height of extension is not subservient to the main ridge and is therefore out of character with the Cotswold vernacular.

**We have complied with the Cotswold Design Code which requires 1.5 Stories, not 2 stories, and stipulates a 50-degree roof pitch.**

2. The size and scale of the proposed development scheme overpowers the original cottage.

**The proposal and its massing has been significantly reduced by 2m as requested and agreed with the Conservation Officer and Planning Officer**

b

Item 02  
18/00526/FUL

3. Proposed bedroom dormer windows overlook neighbouring properties, adversely impacting neighbour amenity.

**Dormer windows have been removed as requested.**

4. Proposed patio doors in the new garden room overlook neighbouring properties, adversely impacting neighbour amenity.

**Both patio doors look north and towards my garden not the neighbours**

5. The size and scale of the proposed development scheme overpowers the adjoining cottage, and we do not believe that sufficient consideration has been given to the resulting potential for loss of amenity, light etc for the present occupant.

**Three adjacent neighbours have written in support of my application because it significantly enhances the aesthetics of the buildings and conservation. The gardens are offset. My garden straddles across the majority of my neighbour's facade. The next-door neighbour's through rooms obtain the majority of their light from the southern facade which is unaffected by the application.**

**This has been accepted by the Planning Officer and he states "On balance it is considered the proposal will not result in unacceptable harm to residential amenity accordance with Policy 46 of the Local Plan and the NPPF."**

6. Proposed incorporation of the existing garage space into the main house and conversion for domestic use is likely to place increased pressure on the green lane behind the cottage for vehicular access. On road parking to the front of the property is already limited by virtue of the narrowness of the road at that point. The Parish Council is opposed to any development that encourages further parking along the village street, as it potentially limits access by emergency vehicles and public transport.

**The garage was originally habitable space as evidenced in the Design Statement photographs. We are returning it to habitable space. As always, we have the ability to park on our own drive at the front AND rear of the property which we own and therefore there is no need to park on the road.**

**The Planning Officer states "The scheme would NOT result in an adverse impact on the highway, parking or highway safety in accordance with Policies 38 and 39 of the Local Plan and paras 38 and 39 of the NPPF."**

7. The Parish council regards development and extension of smaller village properties of this kind as regrettable, as it further reduces opportunities.

**All applications should be treated fair and equitably and not based on socio-economic status or size. Following the amendments made, in conjunction with the Conservation Officer and strict compliance with the Cotswold Design Code this application is enhancing the Conservation Area.**



**F - CONCLUSION**

**This application with the significant amendments made are in accordance with National and Local Planning Policies and have been passed for approval by Cotswold District Council Conservation Officer and Planning Officer.**

**The Planning Officer states *"that planning permission should be granted subject to conditions"***

**These changes occurred after the Parish Council's comments.**

**As a family who have been residents in the district for over 300 years, we are committed to get this right...we really care.**

**There are no compelling or overriding reasons for refusal therefore, we respectfully request that this revised application is approved in line with the District Councils own officer's reports.**

8

Item 02  
18/00526/FUL

Item 02  
18/00526/FL

9

