

COTSWOLD DISTRICT COUNCIL

PLANNING AND LICENSING COMMITTEE

14<sup>TH</sup> NOVEMBER 2018

Present:

Councillor Juliet Layton - Vice-Chairman (in the Chair)

Councillors -

SI Andrews  
AW Berry  
AR Brassington  
Sue Coakley  
PCB Coleman  
RW Dutton

David Fowles  
SG Hirst  
RC Hughes  
MGE MacKenzie-Charrington  
Dilys Neill  
LR Wilkins

Substitutes:

RG Keeling

Observers:

Julian Beale (until 10.40 a.m.)  
Jenny Forde (from 9.35 a.m. until  
11.40 a.m.)

TL Stevenson (from 10.20 a.m.  
until 12.15 p.m.)

Apologies:

Alison Coggins

RL Hughes

PL.62 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

(1) Member Declarations

Councillor Fowles declared an other interest in respect of application 18/02935/FUL, as he was acquainted with the Agent.

Councillor Fowles declared an interest in respect of application 18/02743/FUL, as the Applicant had donated a sum of £1,000 as prize money to the Council's Chairman's Awards Evening in November 2018, which he, as Vice-Chairman of the Council, had helped to organise. He left the room while this item was being discussed.

Councillor Fowles declared an other interest in respect of applications 18/02975/FUL and 18/02976/LBC, as he was acquainted with the Agent.

(2) Officer Declarations

Mrs. S Gargett, Interim Head of Legal Service, declared an 'Other' interest in respect of application 18/03198/FUL as she had been acquainted with the applicant in a professional capacity in a former employment, and she left the room while the matter was being considered

PL.63 SUBSTITUTION ARRANGEMENTS

Councillor RG Keeling substituted for Councillor RL Hughes.

PL.64 MINUTES

**RESOLVED that the Minutes of the Meeting of the Committee held on 10<sup>th</sup> October 2018 be approved as a correct record.**

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

PL.65 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were no announcements from the Chairman.

PL.66 PUBLIC QUESTIONS

No Public Questions had been submitted.

PL.67 MEMBER QUESTIONS

No questions had been received from Members.

PL.68 PETITIONS

No petitions had been received.

PL.69 GAMBLING ACT 2005 - REVIEW OF THE STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES

The Committee received a report detailing the proposed revisions to the Council's Statement of Principles under the Gambling Act 2005 ('the Act'), based on legislative requirements and statutory guidance.

The Committee was requested to consider the revised statement of principles and recommend the document to full Council for adoption in December 2018, in addition to the Council continuing to adopt a 'no-casino resolution' for inclusion in the published Gambling Act 2005 Licensing Policy Statement.

In response to a Member's question, the Service Leader - Licensing confirmed that the other partner Councils had approved the revisions without amendment.

A Member commented that as there had been no comments to the proposed revisions, it would suggest that there were no concerns; and welcomed the inclusion of safeguarding with regard to children.

A Proposition, to accept the Officer's recommendation, was duly Seconded.

**RECOMMENDED that:**

**(a) the reviewed Statement of Principles be approved;**

**(b) the Council continues to adopt a "no-casino resolution" for inclusion in the published Gambling Act 2005 Licensing Policy Statement.**

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

PL.70 ENFORCEMENT - LITTLE COLESBOURNE, WITHINGTON

The Committee was requested to consider the expediency of taking enforcement action in respect of breaches of Conditions at Little Colesbourne, Withington.

The Committee was informed of the retrospective applications submitted on two occasions in an attempt to regularise works, which had been brought to the Council's attention by way of a complaint by a member of the public. These applications had since been refused by Officers under delegated powers.

The Team Leader, Development Management informed the Committee that since publication of the papers for the Meeting, Officers had received a submission from the Landowner proposing a potential compromise solution, which was included within the Additional Representations for the Meeting. She requested that the item be deferred to enable Officers to meet with the Landowner to discuss a revised scheme.

The Chairman then invited those Members who attended a Sites Inspection Briefing at the site to express their views. Those Members commented that the wall was very stark owing to its recent construction but stressed their support for a deferment to enable discussions to take place between Officers and the Landowner. The Committee Officer also read out comments submitted by a Member who had attended the site visit, but was not present at the Meeting. Those comments aligned with the views of those Members that had also attended.

The Ward Member, who served on the Committee, was not present at the Meeting.

A Proposition, to support the Officer's recommendation of deferment, was duly Seconded.

A Member commented that the Proposition would enable the Landowner to retain a wall as well as retaining the historic integrity of the site.

A second Member highlighted that the Council had previously granted an alternative access route to the site, but not the 'closing-up' of the previous access route on the site.

**Deferred, to enable further discussions to take place between Officers and the Landowner.**

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

PL.71 ENFORCEMENT - LITTLE COLESBOURNE, WITHINGTON

The Committee was requested to consider the expediency of taking enforcement action in respect of breaches of Conditions at Little Colesbourne, Withington.

Officers and Members had nothing further to add to their deliberations under the previous item.

A Proposition, to support the Officer's recommendation of be deferment, was duly Seconded.

**Deferred, to enable further discussions to take place between Officers and the Landowner.**

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

PL.72

**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.

The Planning and Development Manager drew attention to the general update provided in the first set of Additional Representations relating to progress with the Local Plan, and the fact that receipt of the Inspector's Final Report meant that the Plan, in its modified form, could now be afforded substantial weight in decision-making, both at Officer level and in the work of the Committee.

**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:-**

**18/02207/REM**

**Development of up to 14 dwellings, public open space, landscaping and other associated works (Reserved Matters application) at Land at Plum Orchard, Moreton Road, Longborough -**

The Case Officer drew attention to the extra representations received since publication of the Schedule of Planning Applications. The Officer also read out an email received from Gloucestershire County Council Highways stating 'I'm aware Committee will be commencing shortly and I am pleased to say you should receive my positive recommendation in due course'. The Case Officer displayed an aerial map of the site, aerial photo and photographs of the site from various vantage points, highlighting a nearby Public Right of Way.

An Objector and the Applicant were then invited to address the Committee.

The Ward Member, who did not serve on the Committee, was then invited to address the Committee. The Ward Member explained that having consulted the Parish Council previously, he did not wish to make any comments under the headings of Scale and Appearance or Layout or Landscaping, but under other matters which he considered necessary to enable a decision to be reached. The Ward Member stated that the village was currently suffering from a serious foul drainage problem which had been existent in the village for the past three years and explained that this was having an effect on the health of neighbouring residents as well as the residents of Plum Tree Close. He added that whilst Thames Water had been consulted, the circumstances had been improved, but not resolved. The Ward Member also highlighted to the Committee that when Outline Permission was granted for the site, residents had been informed by a civil engineer, on behalf of the then owner, that output from any new development would be pumped to the Thames Water sewer at Manhole 0602, North West of the site by Pear Tree Cottage; but explained that this had now changed, resulting in any effluent being drained from the application site into the system serving Plum Tree Close. He added that assurances had been given this would improve the sewerage performance for both developments. The Ward Member also commented that the ownership of the one pumping station would be under that of Bromford. In conclusion, the Ward Member stated that the attempts to persuade the Council that all was 'healthy' in regards to the new application was contrary to an existing track record of the various parties and urged the Committee to either refuse or defer the application to enable Officers to receive a second, expert opinion, on the drainage plans proposed for the site.

In response to various questions from Members to both Council Officers and representatives present from Thames Water, it was reported that the mix of affordable housing was tied to the outline application for the site and therefore could not change unless there was a change to the S106 Agreement; in the view of Council Officers, the pumping station installed by Bromford was too large for the development at Plum Tree Close and that a lack of flow from existing houses was the cause of any foul drainage issues currently being experienced in the village; the Applicant had met with Bromford and agreed that the use of the existing pumping station for the new development was suitable; Council Officers would request the Applicant provide details of the management/maintenance of the pumping station in a future foul drainage condition compliance application which could then be made available to the Ward Member and Parish Council; deferring the reserved matters application would, in the view of Council Officers, set a precedent for future applications; increased foul drainage flow arising from the proposed development would improve the operation of the existing pumping station and would be beneficial; the five-bedroom properties proposed for the site could become three bedroom properties by removing two internal walls but would still have the same floor area as a five bedroom house and therefore, the number of bedrooms was not an accurate determination of property size.

A Member expressed his concern that there had been, in his view, little or no consultation with the Parish Council and that the needs of the village were different to that of the Developer. In response, the Case Officer explained that he had responded to the Parish Council's concerns in writing and that they had subsequently withdrawn all previous objections apart from those relating to drainage.

Various Members enquired as to the options for ensuring any drainage conditions were met by the Developer. In response, Officers explained that issues relating to foul drainage consequently meant that houses could not be occupied unless sewage systems were correctly working; and that there were options available to the Council in regards to enforcement.

Another Member commented that she considered it was unsuitable to focus entirely on drainage and, whilst she understood the concerns from residents, asked if a condition could be added that the compliance application in regard to drainage be presented to the Committee in due course. She added that the mix of housing was nothing the Committee could have control over, but highlighted that, in her view, the application presented a mix of smaller, open-market housing and that the houses were all of a similar size regardless of the number of bedrooms they contained.

A Proposition, that the application be approved with conditions, was duly Seconded.

The Ward Member was then invited to address the Committee again. The Ward Member explained that in his view, there was no such thing as too much consultation and that he felt Piper Homes should have met with the Parish Council previously. He added that when the development at Plum Tree Close had been constructed, there was a requirement for a sewage plan to be in place, but that this had consequently never been affective. He concluded that he had also been in close consultation with all parties involved and that whilst he had heard many suggestions and promises; little had come to fruition.

**Approved, as recommended, subject to a compliance condition in regard to drainage being presented to the Committee in due course.**

**Record of Voting, for 11, against 0, abstentions 3, absent 1.**

#### **18/02743/FUL**

**Variation of Condition 3 of planning permission 17/01689/FUL to allow drainage works to be agreed after their installation in accordance with the submitted drainage strategy at Stratton Court, Stratton Place, Stratton, Cirencester -**

The Case Officer drew attention to the extra representations received since publication of the Schedule of Planning Applications. The Case Officer displayed an aerial map of the site, aerial photo and photographs of the site from various vantage points.

The Ward Member, who served on the Committee, was then invited to address the Committee. The Ward Member explained that the application represented a substantial development and explained that he recognised how much capital had been put into the site and expressed his hope that the development would prove successful. He explained that the landscaping and lighting of the site had been presented to the Committee at its Meeting in June 2018 and that this had highlighted the patience of neighbouring residents. The Ward Member added that, owing to the over-bearing nature of the building, the area where landscaping was most required was also the location at which drainage left the site and therefore the Committee, in his view, should consider the landscaping of the site at the same time as drainage. The Ward Member concluded that whilst a landscaping option had been promised, this had not come forward and

therefore commented that he considered it of no great urgency to make a decision in regards to drainage at the site owing to the lack of landscaping options being presented.

In response to various questions from Members to both Council Officers and representatives present from Thames Water, it was reported that Thames Water had undertaken an initial assessment which had resulted in Gloucester Road being seen to meet its target but when connected to Albion Street they had concerns about the impact upon the existing sewer, though following further consideration, and subject to the flows from the site being limited to 2.5 litres per second, this had resulted in a level of 8% of capacity being predicted; this detailed assessment had concluded that there were no longer concerns or risks within the area; Thames Water were aware of odour complaints within the area but that odour did not suggest any incapacity in the system and the figures used to calculate the requirement were in line with the application proposals and were, in the view of Thames Water, often over-calculated.

A Member expressed his frustration that the Council could not fine the Applicant for unnecessary issues they had caused the Council. He also stated that he felt the Committee should consider the application in line with the Landscape Plan and added that the extra half-storey to the application building gave rise to issues for other residents.

Another Member commented that as the drainage system was already in place and Thames Water had confirmed they considered it acceptable, the Committee should be minded to approve the application, as recommended.

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

A third Member highlighted to the Committee that the landscaping scheme would be presented to the Committee and with regard to the comment made by the Ward Member, explained that the scheme was about the centre of the site and not the perimeters, which were deemed to be causing concern.

The Ward Member was then invited to address the Committee again. The Ward Member thanked Officers from Thames Water for attending the Meeting and concluded that he hoped the guarantees provided were truthful and would not require enforcement by the Council at a later date.

**Approved, as recommended.**

**Record of Voting, for 7, against 5, abstentions 1, interest declared 1, absent 1.**

**18/02935/FUL**

**Erection of one new dwelling together with associated ancillary development at Land adjacent to The Malts House, Perrotts Brook, Bagendon, Cirencester -**

The Case Officer drew attention to the extra representations received since publication of the Schedule of Planning Applications. The Case Officer displayed an aerial map of the site, aerial photo, elevation drawings and photographs of the site from various vantage points. The Case Officer also informed the Committee that an application had been presented in 2017 for

three dwellings on the site, but that this had been amended to one dwelling only, which was currently being built.

The Agent was then invited to address the Committee.

The Ward Member, who did not serve on the Committee but who was present at the Meeting, was unable to speak as she was related to the Applicant.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that a garage was not contained within the amended proposals; in the view of the Council's Landscape and Conservation Officers, the proposals would be an extension of the existing development line; public consultation in regard to the amended plans had started on 1<sup>st</sup> November 2018 and would conclude on 15<sup>th</sup> November 2018 and hence the Officer recommendation was to refuse, subject to no new material considerations being raised via the consultation; the recommendation to refuse was as a result of the proposals conflicting with Policy DS3; the site was north of the existing group of buildings; there was no development boundary for Perrotts Brook in the Local Plan and no comments had been received from Highways in regard to the application as they only provided standard advice on applications of this size.

A Member highlighted the fact that the application had received no support from local residents or the Parish Council; a previous application had been refused at the site in 2017 and that 15 objections had been received from residents; and that there was therefore no reason to approve the application.

A Proposition, that the application be refused as recommended, was duly Seconded.

Another Member commented that the application was located on a sustainable site with a good bus service and that he considered the site would be well-suited under Policy DS3. He also commented that he felt the application would be lost at appeal if not approved by the Committee.

A third Member expressed the view that Policy DS3 supported small developments in villages where there was support from local people, which he stated this application did not have.

**Refused, as recommended.**

**Record of Voting, for 11, against 1, abstentions 1, interest declared 1, absent 1.**

**18/03198/FUL**

**Conversion of barn to single storey dwelling (revised scheme) at Dutch Barn, Nesley Farm, Nesley, Tetbury -**

The Case Officer drew attention to the extra representations received since publication of the Schedule of Planning Applications. The Case Officer displayed an aerial map of the site, aerial photo, floor plans and photographs of the site from various vantage points. The Case Officer also informed the Committee that paragraph 8 of page 89 of the Officer report should be disregarded and that the previous decision notice was attached to the Officer report rather than the previous report as stated.



An Objector and the Applicant were then invited to address the Committee.

The Ward Member, who did not serve on the Committee, was then invited to address the Committee. The Ward Member explained that the Applicant had undertaken a large volume of work in order to resolve confusions relating to parking and commented that there was no shared access for the stone barn on the site, this being the subject of a strict covenant regarding access. The Ward Member added that if the Committee was minded to approve the application, right of access would be given to the occupants and proceeded to highlight the work undertaken by the Applicant in regards to resolving issues around fenestrations and other aspects. The Ward Member also stated that the stone barn was a non-designated heritage asset. In conclusion, the Ward Member stated that there were 10 developments in Charlton Down and that the removal of the Dutch Barn would improve the appearance of the adjacent stone barn and urged the Committee, if unsure of its decision, to undertake a Sites Inspection Briefing.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that the item had been re-presented to the Committee as the Applicant considered that certain issues had not been properly presented at the June 2018 Committee Meeting and he felt that the revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) would have an impact; the Case Officer advised Members that the then emerging plan policies had been referred to in the previous report; in the view of Officers, the barn would need significant alterations and was therefore unsuitable for development; opinion on conversion versus rebuild was informed by a High Court decision; Officers considered there to be no value in preserving the Dutch barn; and the barn did feature an asbestos roof.

A Member commented that he liked the proposals and considered the removal of the pole barn to represent a significant improvement at the site. He also added that, whilst he appreciated the light emissions, he did not consider the emissions to be of that much significance.

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

Various Members expressed support for the Proposition explaining that the barn was past being able to be used as a farm building and the fact the proposals suggested a conversion rather than a new development. A Member also reminded the Committee that, if the barn was too costly to keep standing, it should be removed.

Others Members expressed the view that as the barn was not capable of conversion in the view of Officers, the Committee should accept the Officer's recommendation. Those Members stated that whilst nobody disagreed that the stone barn should be enhanced, this application would not result in an achievement.

A further Proposition, that the application be refused as recommended, was duly Seconded.

The Ward Member was then invited to address the Committee again. The Ward Member expressed her disappointment in the approach that the Committee's deliberations had taken and reminded the Committee of her view that a Sites Inspection Briefing would be the best option for enabling a decision to be made in regard to the application. She concluded by stating that she felt it

was correct on this occasion to go against planning policy as the application would help to improve the area and provide a suitable dwelling.

On being put to the vote, the initial Proposition to approve the application was LOST, with the Record of Voting being - for 4, against 9, abstentions 1, absent 1.

**Refused, as recommended.**

**Record of Voting, for 9, against 4, abstentions 1, absent 1.**

**18/02715/FUL**

**Demolition of existing garage and erection of detached annexe at Nethercote Bridge Cottage, Marshmouth Lane, Bourton-on-the-Water -**

The Case Officer drew attention to the change of description of development for the associated Listed Building Consent application since publication of the Schedule of Planning Applications. Listed Building consent was required for the demolition of the garage and not for the erection of the annexe. The Case Officer displayed a location map of the site, garage drawings, photographs from various vantage points and a Google virtual street view of the site.

A representative from the Parish Council, an Objector and the Applicant were then invited to address the Committee.

The Ward Member, who was serving on the Committee as a Substitute Member, was then invited to address the Committee. The Ward Member explained that he had taken note of the Parish Council's objections and those of local objectors when considering the application and explained to the Committee the difficulties in regard to traffic on Marshmouth Lane. The Ward Member added that whilst the Applicant had made substantial changes to the proposals in order to reduce the impact of the application, he considered the style and size of the proposals would still overwhelm the adjacent listed cottage. In conclusion, the Ward Member explained that whilst he appreciated the business needs of the Applicant in regard to the holiday cottage business of the site; the issue of tourism was a live topic within the community and urged the Committee to refuse the application for the benefit of the neighbouring residents.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that there were three bedrooms within the cottage and the proposed annexe would be of the same dwelling class use as the cottage; the existing garage footprint was 28.9 square metres and the annexe footprint a total of 40 square metres; in the view of the Conservation Officer, the development was of an acceptable scale as the annexe would replace an existing garage which was in a poor condition and be constructed of the same materials as the garage and revised plans of a reduced annexe size had resulted in the Officer recommendation being adjusted from refuse to permit.

A Member commented that most stone cottages within the District featured wooden outbuildings and explained that the annexe would be subservient to the cottage. She also expressed the view that the Applicant had undertaken a large volume of work to reduce the impact and that the concern from the Parish Council and Objector had been over the use of the actual building and not the application proposals. The Member concluded that tourism and holidays were

a key part of the District; especially within the location in which the application site was located.

Various Members echoed their support for the application and commented that they considered the fact parking was sufficiently provided and that the annexe would not be clearly visible from the road suggested the application should be approved.

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

Other Members expressed the view that they considered the annexe should be constructed of stone and that it currently was too large for the site. Those Members also explained that they did not consider the annexe would provide anything extra to the business and expressed their support for refusing the application.

A further Proposition, that the application be refused, was duly Seconded.

The Ward Member was invited to address the Committee again. The Ward Member commented that the Committee's debate had focussed only on the size of the annexe and not the fact the annexe would be located next to a listed cottage. He concluded by emphasising that he considered the site would be overwhelmed by the annexe, if the Committee approved the application.

On being put to the vote, the initial Proposition to approve the application was LOST, with the Record of Voting being - for 5, against 8, abstentions 1, absent 1.

**Refused, for reasons relating to the materials, size and mass and the resultant impact of the proposed annexe on the adjacent listed building and character and appearance of the locality.**

**Record of Voting, for 8, against 5, abstentions 1, absent 1.**

Note:

This decision was contrary to the Officer's recommendation for the reasons outlined above.

### **18/02731/LBC**

#### **Demolition of existing garage at Nethercote Bridge Cottage, Marshmouth Lane, Bourton-on-the-Water-**

The Case Officer informed the Committee of the amendment to the application description, following its decision on the previous item, resulting in the application now solely relating to the demolition of the existing garage. The Case Officer then proceeded to remind the Committee of the location of the site and outlined the proposals and, in addition, informed the Committee that the final two paragraphs of page 130 of the circulated report were now to be removed from the Committee's consideration of the application.

In response to a Member's question, the Case Officer confirmed that, in the view of the Conservation Officer, the garage was not considered worthy of preserving.

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

**Approved, as recommended,**

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

**18/02975/FUL**

**Erection of new dwelling with new driveway at The Old Rectory, 15 Church Street, Meysey Hampton -**

The Case Officer informed the Committee of the reasoning behind the application being brought to Committee being that the Council owned part of the application site. The Case Officer then reminded the Committee of the location of the site and outlined the proposals. The Case Officer also displayed a site location plan, highlighting the parking area owned by the Council, an aerial view and existing site layout of the site and photographs of the site from various vantage points.

Two Objectors and the Agent then addressed the Committee.

The Ward Member, who served on the Committee and who had declared an interest in the application, was then invited to address the Committee prior to leaving the room. The Ward Member explained that the car park had an established Right of Way through it and that this had carried on with the new owner. He explained that the application would have been dealt with under delegated powers but, as he would still have been required to declare an interest in the application, this had necessitated it being brought to Committee. The Ward Member added that the original application had been for two dwellings on the site but explained that this had been withdrawn owing to the number of objections to the proposals. The Ward Member concluded that the Committee should bear in mind relevant policies in regards to the acceptance of associated issues with the Tree Preservation Order at the site when reaching a decision and that whilst the Applicant had undertaken a great deal of work with the application; and expressed his concern that there would be an impact on the amenity from the application and the establishment of a new home in an area of historic developments.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that the distance between the two properties on Church Street and the proposed building was 33 metres and that this was considered acceptable when compared to the minimum 22 metre window to window national design guidance; a local drainage engineer has suggested conditions but Thames Water had not commented as the application fell under statutory duties; the application did not merit consulting Heritage England and Gloucestershire Archaeology self-served on applications; no garage was contained within the proposals, only two parking spaces; and the Conservation Officer did not consider the proposals to be harmful or to outweigh the benefits of the application.

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

A Member commented that whilst the Committee had listened to the Objector's comments and the issues regarding the loss of existing residents' view, there was nothing the Committee could undertake to protect this.

**Approved, as recommended.**

**Record of Voting, for 13, against 0, abstentions 0, interest declared 1, absent 1.**

**18/02976/LBC**

**Removal of part of boundary wall for the erection of new dwelling at The Old Rectory, 15 Church Street, Meysey Hampton -**

Officers and Members had nothing further to add to their deliberations under the previous item.

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

**Approved, as recommended.**

**Record of Voting, for 13, against 0, abstentions 0, interest declared 1, 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.

(ii) Public Speaking

Public speaking took place as follows:-

<u>18/02207/REM</u>	)	Mrs. R Wright (Objector)
	)	Mr. R Parkin (Applicant)
<u>18/02935/FUL</u>	)	Mr. A Pywell (Agent)
<u>18/03198/FUL</u>	)	Mr. S Handy (Objector)
	)	Mr. D Morris (Applicant)
<u>18/02715/FUL</u>	)	Cllr. R Daniel (on behalf of the Parish Council)
	)	Mr. K Lenihan (Objector)
	)	Mr. G Macropoulos (Applicant)
<u>18/02731/LBC</u>	)	Cllr. R Daniel (on behalf of the Parish Council)
	)	Mr. K Lenihan (Objector)
	)	Mr. G Macropoulos (Applicant)
<u>18/02975/FUL</u>	)	Mr. A Pywell (Objector)
	)	Mr. P Barnett (Objector)
	)	Mr. J Rees (Agent)

18/02976/LBC ) Mr. A Pywell (Objector)  
 ) Mr. P Barnett (Objector)  
 ) Mr. J Rees (Agent)

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.73 SITES INSPECTION BRIEFINGS

1. Members for 5<sup>th</sup> December 2018

It was noted that Councillors SI Andrews, AR Brassington, RW Dutton and RC Hughes, together with the Chairman, would represent the Committee at the Sites Inspection Briefing on 5<sup>th</sup> December 2018.

2. Advance Sites Inspection Briefings

It was noted that advance Sites Inspection Briefings would take place on Wednesday 5<sup>th</sup> December 2018 in respect of the following applications:-

18/01615/FUL - Residential re-development consisting of 26 residential (C3) units and associated works at Ullenwood Court, Ullenwood, Gloucestershire, GL53 9QS - for Members to familiarise themselves given the passage of time since the approval of the outline scheme for 20 dwellings on the site (ref: 14/00602/OUT) and to inform consideration of the likely impact of the proposed development on the openness of the Green Belt, the Cotswolds AONB and adjacent Cotswold Way.

18/03737/FUL - Conversion and extension of existing redundant surgery to form a two-bedroom dwelling at The Surgery, Station Road, Andoversford, Gloucestershire, GL54 4HP - to enable Members to fully understand the site and its constraints; to be able to assess the impact of the proposal on neighbouring residents; and to assess whether the proposal represents overdevelopment of the site.

Note:

These advance Sites Inspection Briefings would be undertaken by the Sites Inspection Briefing Panel.

PL.74 LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEES

1. Members for 19<sup>th</sup> December 2018

There were no scheduled items necessitating a Sub-Committee meeting on this date.

2. Advance Licensing Sub-Committees

It was noted that Councillors SI Andrews, AR Brassington, David Fowles, SG Hirst and Juliet Layton, would represent the Committee at the Licensing Sub-Committee on 21<sup>st</sup> November 2018.

PL.75     OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business that was urgent.

The Meeting commenced at 9.30 a.m., adjourned between 11.04 a.m. and 11.15 a.m., and closed at 1.30 p.m.

Chairman

(END)