

PLANNING AND LICENSING COMMITTEE

10th October 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 - 4

PLANNING AND LICENSING COMMITTEE

10th October 2018

ADDITIONAL PAGES ON SCHEDULE ITEMS

Item	Ref. No	Content
02 03	18/02189/FUL 18/02190/LBC	<p>Case Officer Update:</p> <p>“The originally submitted plans sought to remove all existing window frames and replace with double glazing to which would have failed to preserve the special interest or significance of the listed building. The revised plan received 17th September now seeks to repair existing windows where possible, or replace where necessary with like-for-like profiles and materials. This would follow Historic England's advice and therefore the Council raise no objection.”</p> <p>Further Third Party Comment received – see attached email dated 5th October 2018.</p>
09	18/02389/FUL	<p>Case Officer Update:</p> <p>A plan has been received which has revised the enclosures to plots 3-8 (reducing the height of the boundary wall to 0.6m and repositioning the rails). A key has been added to the enclosures plan to update materials. Condition 2 has been updated to reflect the amended plans.</p> <p>Conditions 9 and 12 have been combined and condition 9 now reads as follows:</p> <p><i>A Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP) shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority before occupation of the development. The content of the LEMP shall include, but not necessarily be limited to, the following information:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><i>i) Landscape and ecological trends and constraints on site that might influence management;</i><i>ii) Aims and objectives of management;</i><i>iii) Appropriate management options for achieving aims and objectives;</i><i>iv) Prescriptions for management actions;</i><i>v) Preparation of a work schedule (including an annual</i>

		<p><i>work plan/matrix capable of being rolled forward over a 5-10 year period);</i></p> <p><i>vi) Details of the body or organisation responsible for implementation of the plan;</i></p> <p><i>vii) Ongoing monitoring and remedial measures;</i></p> <p><i>viii) Timeframe for reviewing the plan; and</i></p> <p><i>ix) Details of how the aims and objectives of the LEMP will be communicated to the occupiers of the development</i></p> <p><i>The LEMP shall also include details of the legal and funding mechanism(s) by which the long-term implementation of the plan will be secured by the developer with the management body (ies) responsible for its delivery. The plan shall also set out (where the results from monitoring show that the conservation aims and objectives of the LEMP are not being met) how contingencies and/or remedial action will be identified, agreed and implemented. The LEMP shall be implemented in full in accordance with the approved details.</i></p> <p>An additional condition has been added:</p> <p><i>The entire landscaping scheme as shown on plan P17_2667_100 Rev B shall be completed by the end of the planting season immediately following the completion of the development or the site being brought into use, whichever is the sooner.</i></p>
10	18/03000/FUL	<p>Case Officer Update:</p> <p>Updated Site Description:</p> <p>The site is located within the Cotswold Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) albeit a built-up part, with the south-east corner of the site lying on the boundary of the Bourton-on-the-Water Conservation Area. Although the application site is not within the Conservation Area, Officers have prepared the following additional assessment to take into account any impact the proposed development may have upon the special character of that area.</p> <p>Additional Report Section:</p> <p>(c) Impact on the Bourton-on-the-Water Conservation Area</p> <p>The application site is situated in close proximity to the Bourton-on-the-Water Conservation Area, whereby the Local Planning Authority is statutorily obliged to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the area, in accordance with Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed</p>

Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that in determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of the desirability of sustaining or enhancing the significance of heritage assets. In particular, paragraph 193 states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, such as a Conservation Area, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be).

Policy EN10 of the Local Plan relates to Designated Heritage Assets, stating that great weight will be given to an asset's conservation in considering proposals that affect them. Development proposals that sustain and enhance the character, appearance and significance of designated heritage assets (and their settings), and that put them to viable uses, consistent with their conservation, will be permitted.

Policy EN11 relates specifically to Conservation Areas stating that development proposals that would affect Conservation Areas and their settings, will be permitted provided they "preserve and where appropriate enhance the special character and appearance of the Conservation Area in terms of siting, scale, form, proportion, design, materials and the retention of positive features."

It is not adjudged that the siting of a timber boarded fence in the proposed location, and of the proposed scale and design, would have a harmful impact over and above what already exists within the vicinity of the application site. Within this context officers consider that the special character of the Conservation Area would be preserved, and the proposal accords with Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Section 16 of the NPPF and Local Plan Policies EN10 and EN11.

(ITEM 02 + 03)

From: Planning mail
Sent: 05 October 2018 09:43
To: Hannah Rose
Subject: Comments for Planning Application 18/02189/FUL

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 9:42 AM on 05 Oct 2018 from Mr Derek Newman.

Application Summary

Address: Amphlett House Pancake Hill Chedworth Cheltenham
Gloucestershire GL54 4AW

Proposal: Conversion and linking of former stables building (currently
used for domestic storage) to dwelling

Case Officer: Hannah Rose

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name: Mr Derek Newman

Address: Cotswold House Pancake Hill Chedworth

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Comments of Support

Stance: Customer made comments in support of the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

- Impact on Conservation Area
- Impact on Listed Building

Comments: Further to my previous comment, having now read through the Conservation Officers report I would now like to make additional points.

While I appreciate that both National and Local guidelines are in place to protect Heritage Assets it does seem to me as if this building is being regarded as if it should be 'preserved in aspic'. It is a private dwelling, not a museum, and as such doesn't have any public access.

"Its prominent position and appealing, picturesque quality also make it of fortuitous aesthetic value" Indeed, but the point of the application is to make it habitable for the purpose of contemporary living. There must be many thousands of dwellings that have had their original earth closet privy's removed and replaced with more hygienic installations as progress evolved, so why consider the removal of this one "harmful to the erosion of special interest and significance of the building"?

The Conservation Officer concludes that "cumulative harm" would be the result of the sensitive and considered upgrade of this historic building as the submitted plans outline. As a resident of Pancake Hill I would conclude the opposite - far more harm will occur with further dilapidation if the applicant didn't have the vision and commitment to breathe life back into a private dwelling that is clearly currently unfit for purpose. That will be the "public benefit" to those of us in the community who live close by.

